The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXXIV • FEBRUARY, 1948 • NUMBER 1

THE PLACE OF RHETORIC IN POETIC THEORY

MARVIN T. HERRICK

THE sub-title of an important edition of Terence, published at Zurich in 1550, contains the following:

> The commentaries of Iodocus Willichius Resellianus on the same, in which is presented an account of invention, disposition, and style in each of the scenes, with an explanation of some obscure passages.

Willichius, who prepared the edition for use in schools, proceeded to do just what the title promised; he rhetorically analyzed every scene in the six plays of Terence, pointing out how Terence invented his arguments, how he put them together, and how he clothed them in the proper sentiments and figures. He tried to classify each scene as deliberative, judicial, or demonstrative, finding some scenes, to be sure, mixtures of two or even three types of oratory. Willichius thought of each scene in a play as an oration; the short scene was often a little oration, an *oratiuncula*. When he could, and he was often able, he analyzed the quantitative structure of the scenes according to the conventional rhetorical scheme of exordium, statement of facts (*narratio*), proof (*confirmatio*), disproof (*refutatio*), and peroration. He did not neglect the traditional dramatic analysis (itself rhetorical in origin) of *prologue, protasis, epitasis, catastrophe,* but showed how the rhetorical form and expression of individual scenes supported the dramatic pattern of the play.

MARVIN T. HERRICK *is Professor of English at the University of Illinois. This article is a chapter from his forthcoming book on the Foundations of Modern Theories of Comedy.*

I

Willichius' analysis of the *catastrophe* of the *Eunuch* (5.9.1031ff.) furnishes a good illustration of his methods, which, in turn, is similar to methods employed by other commentators in the sixteenth century. This scene contains the final resolution wherein all errors and misunderstandings are cleared up. Chaerea wins Pamphila for his bride, Phaedria wins Thais for his mistress, the old people are satisfied, Gnatho the parasite wins a new patron, Thraso the braggart soldier wins an amnesty and is allowed to provide the purse for Phaedria and Thais. According to Willichius, the scene is built up as follows:

EXORDIUM: Chaerea opens the scene with an outburst expressing his overflowing happiness. As is proper in an exordium, this speech secures good will and attention.

NARRATIO: The *narratio* tells why Chaerea is happy. Pamphila, the slave girl, has turned out to be an Athenian citizen and therefore eligible to become

his bride. Furthermore, his brother has now disposed of all rivals and has sole possession of the beautiful Thais.

PROOF: The happiness of Phaedria, and of Chaerea, is confirmed by the generous action of their father, who has consented to become the patron and protector of Thais.

DISPROOF: There is also some use of disproof in this scene. Gnatho, the clever parasite, tries to persuade Phaedria and Chaerea, for their own interests, to make up with Thraso, whose purse, Gnatho argues, will be very useful. Gnatho removes the objections that the young men have to such an alliance by pointing out that "there is no man who entertains better or more liberally."

PERORATION: Any attention to peroration in this scene was unnecessary since it is the last scene in the play and ends with the conventional "Farewell and clap your hands!"

Such an analysis may strike a twentieth-century student of comedy as a strange exercise and one better calculated for oratory than for drama. It did not strike the sixteenth-century student as strange; it was the usual procedure, a procedure that had been followed by interpreters of Terentian comedy since the time of Donatus in the fourth century. Willichius was more systematic, perhaps, than Donatus and others in his application of classical rhetoric to Terence, but he was following the usual practice. And his chief authorities were the conventional authorities on rhetoric and poetry in the sixteenth century: Cicero, Quintilian, Hermogenes, Aristotle, Plato, Horace, and Donatus. This strictly rhetorical analysis was not the only approach to the study of Terence in the century. Some scholars, in fact, seemed to disapprove of Willichius' method. Matthias Bergius objected to studying a Terentian comedy as a whole play or as an oration. "Much more ridiculous," he asserted, "is the labor of those who seek sedulously and even at great length what they call arguments, not only of whole comedies, which might appear bearable, but also of every scene."[1] Bergius himself favored a grammatical and metrical study of Terence. Christopher Johnson, who became headmaster of Winchester in 1560, found fault with the use of plays at school: "For what else is comedy than a laborious nothing? Invention difficult, disposition laborious, the description of parts [characterization] difficult."[2] These complaints, however, suggest that the rhetorical analysis of drama was standard practice. So it was.

II

The twentieth-century student of literary criticism has to keep in mind that the medieval trivium of logic, grammar, and rhetoric was still in force during the sixteenth century, though considerably modified. For centuries the study of literature, of poetry, had been by way of grammar and rhetoric, and the sixteenth-century still studied literature by way of grammar and rhetoric. In recent years this position of rhetoric and poetry has been radically changed. Today the student of literary criticism generally dismisses the older rhetoric as something that went out of fashion with William Jennings Bryan and Chautauqua declamations and gives his whole attention to poetics, to what he likes to think is a purely aesthetic approach to literature. But our modern poetics, including our modern theories of dramatic art, are outgrowths of this older rhetoric. Modern poetics, including the

[1] *P. Terentii Afri comoediae sex*, edited by Matthias Bergius (Leipzig, 1574), p. 401.

[2] Quoted by T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* (Urbana, 1944) 1.329.

theory of comedy, was built up largely by schoolmasters and commentators whose own training was rhetorical and whose outlook was rhetorical. Some students of these schoolmasters learned their lessons well. As Professor Baldwin[3] has brilliantly demonstrated, the literary training of our greatest English playwright, Shakespeare, was rhetorical. Much of our difficulty and misunderstanding today would be removed if we could remember that poetry and rhetoric are not oil and water that refuse to mix. We must combat the depreciation of rhetoric and oratory that romantic critics have foisted upon us. John Stuart Mill's statement that eloquence is *heard* and poetry is *over*heard is clever and partly true, but it is very misleading if we conclude from it that all eloquence is unpoetic. If we decry rhetorical eloquence, then we must condemn as unpoetic the major compositions of our greatest poets, Milton and Shakespeare.

The ancients and their Renaissance disciples did not make such a mistake; they rightly regarded oratory and poetry as cognate arts, nourished by the same disciplines of logic, grammar, and rhetoric. Plato treated poetry and rhetoric together in the *Phaedrus*. Aristotle repeatedly referred the reader of his *Poetics* to the *Rhetoric*, and *vice versa*. Cicero time and again drew upon poetry, including the plays of Terence, for illustrations of rhetorical principles. Probably the best known, most often quoted, comparison of poet with orator came from Cicero's *De Oratore* (1.16.70): "The poet, indeed, is closely allied to the orator, being somewhat more restricted in numbers, but freer in the choice of words, yet in many kinds of ornament his ally and almost his equal." Quintilian, who exerted a profound influence upon the schools of the Renaissance, often illustrated general observations on rhetoric from the poets. His remarks in the *Institutio Oratoria* (10.1.69) on Menander, the chief model for Terence, may be cited as typical of the ancient, and Renaissance, attitude towards poetry and oratory:

> The careful study of Menander alone would, in my opinion, be sufficient to develop all those qualities with the production of which my present work is concerned; so perfect is his representation of actual life, so rich is his power of invention and his gift of style, so perfectly does he adapt himself to every kind of circumstance, character, and emotion.

Quintilian also joined in praise of Homer's eloquence; some of the speeches in the *Iliad*, he maintained, "display all the rules of art to be followed in forensic or deliberative oratory." Hermogenes, who was well known to scholars in the sixteenth century, offered an even greater eulogy of Homer, "the best of all poets, orators, and writers."[4] Aphthonius, the fourth-century rhetorician whose *Progymnasmata Rhetorica* was a popular schoolbook in western Europe throughout the sixteenth century, emphasized, in his first sentence, the common ground between poetry and rhetoric: "In the beginning the fable belonged to the poets. Afterwards, because it was suitable for instructing boys, it was adopted by the rhetoricians." An early Italian humanist, Gasparino Barzizza (d. 1431), remarked that orator, grammarian, and poet were necessarily allies and interdependent. "What," he said, "would Cicero profit me without Priscian and Terence and other poets; what Priscian without Cicero and Terence; finally, what Terence without Cicero and Priscian? Nothing certainly."[5] Landinus, whose cele-

[3] See footnote immediately above.

[4] *De Formis Orationum* 2.10.375.

[5] See Karl Vossler, *Poetische Theorien in der Italienischen Frührenaissance* (Berlin, 1900), p. 69.

brated commentary on Horace first appeared in 1482, called special attention to the common precepts guiding orator and poet, both of whom had to regard invention, disposition, and style. He took for granted that Horace, in his *Art of Poetry,* was concerned with invention, disposition, and style. Landinus was one of the first to transfer Cicero's praise of the ideal orator as the supremely learned man to the poet. According to Landinus, the poet especially should try to adorn his poetry with all the arts and sciences.[6] Parrhasius, whose commentary on Horace was first printed in 1531, remarked: "If the oratorical power and art of speaking are lacking, the poet will forthwith be dumb."[7] Daniello, author of an early Renaissance poetics (*La Poetica,* 1536), was primarily interested in poetry, especially in Petrarch, yet his approach was naturally rhetorical. For him, the three principal parts of poetry in general were invention, disposition, and style. The poet, said Daniello (47-49), must master the three kinds of oratory, panegyric, deliberative, and forensic, and his procedure should be by way of exordium, arguments, and conclusion. As was fashionable at the time, Daniello devoted most space to style, which he analyzed in the traditional Ciceronian pattern of grand, middle, and humble. He was fond of illustrating his rhetorical generalizations from the *canzoni* of Petrarch. Bartholomaeus Lombardus, who together with Madius published an important commentary on the *Poetics* of Aristotle in 1550, expressed the current attitude, that poet and orator make use of the same faculty and the same devices. Lombardus echoed the suggestion of Landinus that poetry, while a counterpart of rhetoric, is more learned than common speaking.[8] This elevation of poetry over oratory, despite the ancient eulogies of Homer, is not classical, but belongs to the Renaissance and anticipates Minturno's and Scaliger's extravagant praises of Virgil as the wisest and most eloquent of men.

III

Julius Caesar Scaliger presented one of the clearest illustrations of this change of emphasis from the ideal orator to the ideal poet. Minturno before him, however, was quite as enthusiastic in his praise of Virgil as the omniscient artist, and he was even more specific in his rhetorical demands on the poet. "Now, indeed," wrote Minturno in 1559, "what kind of poet and how great a poet will he be who ignores the precepts of the rhetoricians and does not excel in the power of speaking which these rhetoricians challenge."[9] The great poet, like Virgil, must be a master of persuasion, of praise, and of debate. Scaliger, who was not an original critic but followed traditional paths, neatly expressed the evolution of oratory and poetry as an exchange of functions. The early orators sought only to persuade and move; the early poets sought only to please. "In due time, however, orator and poet secured from each other that which they lacked respectively."[10] The orators acquired grace and the poets became more thoughtful and didactic until both orators and poets achieved what Horace, in his *Art of Poetry,* prescribed, the mingling of profit and delight. In the first chapter of his *Poetics,* Scaliger asked and answered this question: "Now is there not one end, and one only, in

[6] See his comments in *Opera Horatii* (Basle, 1555), p. 928.
[7] *Ecphrasis in Horatii Flacci artem poeticam* (Naples, 1531), p. 3r.
[8] *In Aristotelis librum de poetica communes explanationes* (Venice, 1550), p. 2.
[9] *De Poeta,* p. 95.
[10] *Poetices* 3.25.

philosophical exposition, in oratory, and in the drama? Assuredly such is the case. All have one and the same end—persuasion." The orator in the forum, said Scaliger, debates on life, on vice and virtue; philosopher, poet, and historian treat of the same matter in the same spirit; but only poetry is all-inclusive, "excelling those other arts in this, that while they, as we have said above, represent things just as they are, in some sense like a speaking picture, the poet depicts quite another sort of nature, and a variety of fortunes; in fact, by so doing, he transforms himself almost into a second deity."

By 1561, when Scaliger's *Poetics* first appeared, there was obviously some critical separation of orator from poet, and poetry was becoming more carefully discriminated from oratory. Rhetoric, however, was still fundamental in the theory and practice of both oratory and poetry, for poetry was still regarded as rhetorical, and the tools for examining poetry were still primarily rhetorical. Nevertheless, the rhetorical terminology of literary criticism was already becoming somewhat modified. This modification, which ultimately produced modern literary criticism, grew out of an increasing knowledge of the *Poetics* of Aristotle, first made readily available to the sixteenth-century student in 1536, when the Latin version of Alexander Paccius was first printed. The chief pioneer in the formulation of our modern poetics was Franciscus Robortellus, the first (1548) and one of the greatest commentators on the *Poetics* of Aristotle. Robortellus was thoroughly familiar with the ancient arts of rhetoric; he read and used Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Hermogenes, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and virtually all the other classical writers on rhetoric. He had no thought of exalting poetry over oratory, for he believed, as did his contemporaries, that oratory and poetry are sister arts. Nevertheless, Robortellus learned from Aristotle and Horace that there is an art of poetry, specifically an art of dramatic poetry, that can be discriminated from the art of rhetoric in general. This art of poetry is itself rhetorical in large part, but there are peculiar qualitative and quantitative elements that distinguish it *per se*, that form tragedies, comedies, and epic poems.

Before trying to demonstrate how Robortellus and his followers succeeded in squaring the classical theory of rhetoric with the Aristotelian analysis of poetry it is necessary to examine this rhetorical theory in more detail and to determine the role of Terence as rhetorician and poet. Terence and Cicero were the "foundation-stones" for the study of both prose and poetry in the sixteenth century.[11] Terence shared with Cicero the principal authority in rhetoric and Terence himself was the first model in poetry. For comedy, Terence was preferred to the livelier Plautus. Scaliger, for one, attributed this preference to the rhetorical superiority of Terence: "Why then do we make more of him than of Plautus? For the reason that today we are most intent on the art of good speaking (*bene loquendi*)."[12] Cicero[13] more than once praised Terence as a model for the orator. Even if any prompting from Cicero had been wanting, and even if the schoolmasters had not been using Terence as a model, the commentators would have found rhetoric enough in Terence. In the Prologue to the *Self-Tormentor*, for example, the speaker professes to be a pleader (*orator*) delivering an appeal to the audience, de-

[11] See Baldwin, *op. cit.*, 1.448.
[12] *Poetices* 3.97.
[13] *De Inventione* 1.23; *De Oratore* 2.80.326-328.

fending the practice of the author and refuting the attacks of his enemies. Willichius called this prologue a mixed form with a large part of it belonging to the judicial, or forensic, type. Similar is the Prologue to the *Mother-in-law,* which Donatus admired: "This prologue has been written with great art and beyond measure oratorically."[14] Paulus Malleolus added that it is "most observant of the rhetorical rules."

All the commentators admired good rhetorical passages, and they found many in Terence, not only in the prologues but throughout the plays. Donatus, for example, called special attention to an illustration of sound oratorical method in the *Mother-in-law* 4.2.589ff. Here Pamphilus, the young man who has refused to live with his wife Philumena, replies to his mother's offer to step aside and retire to the country:

> Shall her [Philumena's] folly drive you from town to country? It shall not be; nor will I allow the censure that the cause was my obstinacy and not your good nature. I am unwilling that, for my sake, you give up friends, relations, and festivities.

Donatus observed: "See how oratorically he has gathered everything together, from persons, causes, places, and actions." Pamphilus was speaking in the manner approved by Cicero and Quintilian (5.10.23), both of whom stated that all arguments are drawn from persons or from things, which include causes, places, and actions. Another example is the *Self-Tormentor* 2.2.233. Here Clinia, just returned from military service abroad, is worried about his mistress whom he had left behind; he thinks of many reasons why she may have been unfaithful: opportunity, place, her age, and her unscrupulous, avaricious mother. Calphurnius, who supplied the leading commentary on the *Self-Tormentor*—Donatus did not leave one for this play—saw that Clinia, by means of "rhetorical art," is here drawing up confirmatory arguments, all of which come from persons or from things. Barlandus supplied the proper reference to Cicero's *De Inventione* 1.24.

[14] Donatus on *Mother-in-law* 9.

IV

It is hardly necessary to argue whether or not the speeches in Terence follow the prescriptions of rhetoricians or that Cicero learned rhetoric from Terence; the point is that Donatus and his Renaissance followers took for granted that a good comedy is constructed upon sound rhetorical principles, and that the practice of Terence naturally harmonizes with the theory of Cicero and Quintilian. While the commentators took good rhetoric in Terence for granted, they rightly called attention to the more brilliant illustrations of fine rhetoric. Thus Hegendorphinus was particularly struck by the masterly exposition, or *narratio,* of the *Mother-in-law* 1.2. Here Parmeno, in a lively dialogue with Philotis, presents the background of the main argument of the play. "Notice," wrote Hegendorphinus, "the matchless art of the poet in this scene, how excellently he has observed oratorical topics (*loci*) and the decorum of character." In fact, the Renaissance commentators on Terence apparently looked first for rhetoric and then considered the qualities that might particularly distinguish the poetic or dramatic manner. The comment of Calphurnius on the use of the word *morari* in *Self-Tormentor* 1.1.172 will illustrate. Chremes excuses himself with the remark, "I am keeping my guests waiting (*egomet convivas moror*)." Calphurnius remarked that the use of *morari* here instead of *exspectare* is "poetic rather than oratorical"; in other words,

one would normally expect *expectare* in comedy. The commentators, in their minute interpretations of the Terentian comedies, overlooked virtually no canon of classical rhetoric. They carefully distinguished the three kinds of oratory to be found in the plays. They kept always in mind the qualitative parts of a discourse (invention, disposition, style). They analyzed individual scenes in terms of the quantitative parts (exordium, *narratio*, proof, disproof, and conclusion).

The comedies of Terence abound in examples of deliberative, forensic, and demonstrative oratory. Far from being confused by the variety displayed by Terentian characters, the commentators welcomed these rhetorical riches. Willichius, on the *Lady of Andros* 4.2, neatly summed up this phenomenon: "Therefore, many very short forms of oratory are mingled and sometimes interrupted, in which Terence is a notable master," Many a scene, consequently, had to be labeled "mixed discourse" (*oratio mista*). Sometimes a commentator might venture to classify a whole comedy as belonging to one type of oratory. Thus Melanchthon called the *Lady of Andros* deliberative: "The whole play is like the persuasive type of oration, for old men, youths, and servants deliberate (*consultant*) on the whole matter in divers manners."[15] Willichius, possibly following Melanchthon, summarized the argument of the play in similar terms: "It belongs to the deliberative kind. . . . Here are both persuasions and dissuasions of youths, old men, and servants."

V

By common consent of classical authorities, deliberative oratory is the highest type, and its function is persuasion and dissuasion. Trapezuntius, a follower of Hermogenes and a translator of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, who was very influential himself in the sixteenth century, held that deliberative oratory should persuade and dissuade and that its main end is honor or dignity (*honestas*), which may be divided into "prudence, justice, manliness, and moderation."[16] Scenes involving these virtues would normally be deliberative. In the *Mother-in-law* 3.2 (336ff.), for example, Parmeno dissuades Sostrata from interfering in the domestic crisis of her daughter-in-law Philumena. Parmeno urges prudence and moderation on the part of the mother-in-law, who should wait until the son is reconciled to his wife. Quite naturally, then, the commentators from Donatus to Willichius labeled this scene deliberative, containing, as it does, persuasions and dissuasions.

An important element in the comedies of Terence is *consilium* (counsel). According to Melanchthon,[17] "Comedy is nothing unless it is the image of human counsels and events." *Consilia* have to do with doubtful matters, involving consultations about what is right and wrong, what is expedient, and thus naturally belong to deliberative discourse. "Deliberation," said Quintilian (3.8.25), "is always about what is doubtful," and the Terentian commentators echoed him. These *consilia* appear most frequently in the quieter plays like the *Self-Tormentor* and the *Mother-in-law*, but they are prominent throughout all the comedies. A good example of *consilium*, for instance, appears early in the *Eunuch* (1.1), the liveliest of all the plays of Terence. In this scene, Parmeno gives his young master Phaedria realistic advice on how he should ex-

[15] *Terentii Comoedia* (Paris, 1552), p. 3a.

[16] *Rhetoricorum libri* (Basle, 1522), p. 94v.

[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 3a.

tricate himself from the love affair with Thais. Hegendorphinus called the scene deliberative. Melanchthon found the whole play mostly deliberative: "In the foregoing play there are many consultations, and as a whole it is generally of the deliberative kind."[18] Donatus, upon at least one occasion, used the term "comic deliberation"; he applied it to the *Lady of Andros* 1.3.206ff., wherein Davus debates with himself on the most expedient course of action, i.e., whether he should throw in his lot with young master Pamphilus or obey old master Simo. The deliberation is comic, to be sure, because Davus is a humble slave.

Another element in oratory that may have influenced the classification of comic scenes as deliberative is impersonation (*prosopopoeia*), which Quintilian discussed under deliberative oratory. An important accomplishment of good orators, according to Quintilian (3.8.51-52), is the ability to impersonate various characters:

> As a rule, they impersonate sons, parents, rich men, old men, gentle or harsh of temper, misers, superstitious persons, cowards and mockers, so that hardly even comic actors have to assume more numerous rôles in their performances on the stage than these in their declamations. All these rôles may be regarded as forming part of impersonation, which I have included under deliberative themes.

Quintilian's list of roles that the orator must be able to assume certainly looks like a cast of characters in almost any domestic comedy from Terence through Ben Jonson and Molière.

I do not wish to emphasize *prosopopoeia*, however, as a major factor in comic deliberation since another classical authority of influence in the sixteenth century offered a different classification. Aphthonius' scheme of rhetoric, as interpreted by Rodolphus Agricola, put *imitatio*, which was virtually synonymous with *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* in the Renaissance, under demonstrative discourse.[19] Further, although Quintilian discussed *prosopopoeia* under deliberative themes, he (2.10.12-13) did call attention to the similarity between the heightened delivery of comic actors and the air of elegance in epideictic, or demonstrative, oratory.

VI

Forensic oratory was perhaps not so often connected with comedy as were the deliberative and demonstrative types. The principal quantitative scheme for analyzing comic scenes, however, was borrowed from forensic oratory—exordium, *narratio*, proof, peroration—and later on I shall discuss the use of proofs in comedy. Willichius, for one, classified many scenes in Terence as primarily forensic. Such a scene is the *Lady of Andros* 4.1. Here Charinus accuses his friend Pamphilus of treachery; he believes that Pamphilus is going to marry Philumena although his own lady love is Glycerium. Pamphilus, who is still in love with Glycerium, answers the charge by disclaiming any personal desire for the match and shifts the blame to his scheming servant Davus. The servant, in turn, defends his past failure by promises of better advice and better action in the future.

A more obvious example of the forensic manner is *Phormio* 2.1. In this scene, Demipho returns to Athens from abroad to find that his son Antipho has married during his absence. The old gentleman, highly incensed at this unfilial conduct, accuses Antipho and Geta, his slave, of shameful behavior. Antipho lacks the courage to face his father, but his cousin Phaedria defends him by

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 4a.

[19] *Progymnasmata rhetorica* (Salamanca, 1550), p. IV.

means of an argument fabricated and rehearsed beforehand by Geta. Phaedria argues that the inexperienced Antipho was helplessly caught in legal toils and forced into marriage. There was a law which required that orphans be married to the next of kin, and Geta had suggested that the girl was kin to Antipho. Geta defended himself by reminding Demipho that a slave had no right to appear in court and therefore he (Geta) was unable to help his young master. As Willichius observed, this scene is a "legal issue (*status*) in which the inquiry concerns an established law."

VII

Demonstrative oratory deals primarily with praise and blame. It is calculated to delight rather than to persuade, and thus may be closer to the spirit of poetry than are the other types of oratory. In the minds of some classical and medieval authorities, the art of praise and blame was closely connected with poetry. The rhetorical scheme in sixteenth-century editions of Aphthonius listed *praise, blame, imitation,* and *comparison* under demonstrative discourse. As I have suggested above, comedy, which naturally made large use of *mimesis* or *imitatio* (or *prosopopoeia* or *ethopoeia*), may have been specially connected with demonstrative oratory. Averroes certainly supports such a conjecture. According to a sixteenth-century Latin version of Averroes' paraphrase of Aristotle's *Poetics,* "All poetry and every poetic fable is classified as either praise or blame."[20] Poetic fables are "imitative discourses" (*sermones imitatorii*). The best art of praising is tragedy, which praises distinguished actions. Comedy, on the other hand, deals mainly with blame; it blames bad actions, but only those bad actions that are ridiculous and not painful.[21] That Averroes, or his Latin translator, was not merely tossing about terms is indicated by another passage in the paraphrase, where Averroes was trying to follow Aristotle's discussion of the quantitative parts of a tragedy. Even Arabic poems, it seems, were divided into parts that correspond to the divisions of a rhetorical speech, namely, exordium, praise or episode (*laudatio vel episodium*), and conclusion.[22]

At all events, demonstrative speeches and scenes are prominent in both tragedy and comedy. Speeches of praise and blame abound in Terence. Such speeches are specially prominent in the *Brothers,* for example, since this play is a representation of what constitutes proper behavior in the guardian-parent and what in the son. There is much to praise in the behavior of the city-bred brother, Micio, and something to blame. There is much to blame in the intolerant behavior of the rustic brother, Demea, and something to praise. Willichius found that a good part of the *Brothers* 3.4 (364ff.) belongs to the demonstrative kind. Certainly a good part of the scene deals with praise and blame. Syrus, with his tongue in his cheek, praises Ctesipho, the country-bred son of Demea, flatters Demea, and blames the other son (Aeschinus) and the city-bred brother (Micio) for all the family troubles. Donatus called attention to the *laudantis oratio* in the *Brothers* 4.5 (707ff.). Here Aeschinus delivers an ecstatic eulogy of his generous uncle Micio. Any highly emotional

[20] "Omnis Poesis omnisque fabula poetica in vituperandi vel laudandi genere consistit."—*Averrois paraphrasis in librum poeticae Aristotelis,* edited by Fridericus Heidenhain, in *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie, Supplementband* 17 (1890), 354.

[21] *Ibid., pp.* 358-359, 368.

[22] *Ibid.,* p. 367.

speech in comedy was likely to be classified as demonstrative.

It is hardly necessary, I believe, to cite further examples of deliberative, forensic, and demonstrative discourse in Terence. As Quintilian (2.21.23) remarked, the Aristotelian tripartite division brings virtually everything that may arise within the province of the orator. A more important task now is to examine the relationship that the sixteenth century established between the qualitative and quantitative elements of rhetoric and the qualitative and qauntitative elements of poetry. After some necessary discussion of these rhetorical elements I shall try to show how the sixteenth century squared invention, disposition, and style with Aristotle's plot, character, thought, and diction, and how it squared exordium, *narratio*, proof, and peroration with the Aristotelian prologue, episodes, choral odes, and exode.[23]

VIII

The chief classical authority on rhetoric in the sixteenth century was Cicero, closely followed by Quintilian, and the favorite classical text was apparently Cicero's *Partitiones Oratoriae*, which briefly and clearly discusses the functions of the orator and the structure of a speech. From Cicero came the accepted definition of the aim or purpose of oratory: "to teach, to delight, and to move."[24] The functions of the orator are intimately related, of course, with this three-fold purpose of oratory. Johann Sturm, probably the best known interpreter of the *Partitiones Oratoriae* in the sixteenth century, stated this relationship clearly:

> First is invention, next disposition, third style, then delivery, all four of which are preserved by the memory. All these are related to the three [aims], that he should teach, delight, persuade, that is, that he should prevail with what is necessary to victory.[25]

In other words, the successful exercise of invention, disposition, style, *etc.*, will teach, delight, and persuade.

Of these five functions of the orator, or the qualitative parts of oratory, disposition (*dispositio* or *collocatio*) will be discussed in some detail in a later chapter on plot in comedy. Style (*elocutio*) will be discussed in a later chapter on thought and diction. Delivery and memory, important functions of the orator in action, belong rather to the actor or the declaimer than to the poet. Therefore I shall now examine invention, the first qualitative element in rhetoric, and long considered a fundamental element in all art.

The sixteenth century regarded both invention and disposition, i.e., the finding of arguments and their artistic arrangement, as common to both logic and rhetoric. Aristole had recognized the kinship between the two arts; the first sentence of his *Rhetoric* reads:

> Rhetoric is a counterpart of Dialectic; for both have to do with matters that are in a manner within the cognizance of all men and not confined to any special science.

Some sixteenth-century scholars found it difficult to separate rhetorical invention from logical invention; others objected to any such separation. According to Melanchthon, dialectic discovers and organizes arguments but does it briefly and dryly; rhetoric dresses up these arguments in an ornamental, pleasing style.[26] Ramus went further; he insisted that invention and disposition were logical elements which were borrowed

[23] Two other quantitative parts of rhetoric, partition and disproof, were often added. See the *Ad Herennium* 1.3.

[24] See *Brutus* 49.185. Cf. *Orator* 21.69.

[25] *Ioannis Sturmii in partitiones oratorias Ciceroni, dialogi duo* (Strassburg, 1539), p. 18.

[26] "Verum hoc interesse dicunt, quod Dialectica res nudas proponit; Rhetorica uero addit eloquutionem quasi uestitum." *Elementorum rhetorices libri duo* (Strassburg, 1533), p. 12.

by the rhetoricians.[27] Leonard Cox, an Englishman of the sixteenth century who followed Melanchthon, summed up the difference as follows:

> For this is the difference that is between these two sciences, that the logician in disputing observeth certain rules for the setting of his words, being solicitous that there be spoken no more nor no less than the thing requireth and that it be even as plainly spoken as it is thought. But the rhetorician seeketh about and borroweth when he can as much as he may for to make the simple and plain logical arguments gay and delectable to the ear. So then the sure judgment of arguments or reasons must be learned of the logician, but the craft to set them out with pleasant figures and to dilate the matter longeth to the rhetorician.[28]

Alexander Richardson, a seventeenth-century English schoolmaster, followed Ramus and was therefore more biased in favor of logic:

> Now indeed the rhetoricians have taken invention to be a part of rhetoric, and so judgment, but when they come to explain them, they teach logic: and their *dissertus* is not only rhetorician but the grammarian and logician, their orator is *omnium horarum homo*, a man for every turn, so that he is a man in whom there is a confusion of all arts: neither is orator belonging to rhetoric, but he is a general man, that hath all the arts, and chiefly he is a logician.[29]

I have already indicated how the conception of the ideal orator, the "man for every turn," advanced by Cicero and Quintilian, was being transferred during the sixteenth century to the ideal poet, specifically to Virgil or Homer.

The most important modification of this logical-rhetorical *inventio*, when applied to the poet, came about with the modification of the traditional notions of imitation; it began to appear when Plato and Aristotle became better known to those who were interested in poetry, when Plato's and Aristotle's explanations of imitation were added to the familiar remarks in Horace, Cicero, Quintilian, and Donatus. Apparently every educated man in the Renaissance was familiar with the Ciceronian definition of comedy transmitted by Donatus: "the imitation of life, the mirror of custom, the image of truth." Donatus himself drew mainly upon Cicero and Quintilian, although he may have been familiar with an earlier conception of imitation that goes back to Plato.

Socrates, in the *Republic* (392-394) restricted the imitative style to the drama. According to Socrates, there are three styles in poetry: (1) simple narration, as in the dithyramb; (2) imitation, as in tragedy and comedy; (3) mixed narration and imitation, as in the Homeric epic poem. Aristotle, in the *Poetics* (3) thought of imitation in a wider sense:

> Given both the same means and the same kind of object for imitation, one may either (1) speak at one moment in narrative and at another in an assumed character, as Homer does; or (2) one my remain the same throughout, without any change; or (3) the imitators may represent the whole story dramatically, as though they were actually doing the things described.

The narrower Platonic view was that imitation is the assimilation of the speaker to another character. When Donatus used the term *mimesis*, and he often did, he usually meant mimicking, assimilating the speaker to another character. He was familiar with the notion of a mixed style, though precisely how he distinguished between the two is not altogether clear. For example, on the *Lady of Andros* 4.5.773, where Davus describes to Mysis what thoughts must be going on in the mind of Glycerium,

[27] See *Scholae in liberales artes* (Basle, 1569), pp. 253ff; Talaeus, *Rhetorica et P. Rami praelectionibus observata* (Frankfort, 1584), p. 29.

[28] *The Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke*, edited by F. I. Carpenter (Chicago, 1899), p. 48.

[29] *The Logicians School-Master: or, a Comment upon Ramus Logick, whereunto are added, his Prelections on Ramus his Grammer; Taleus his Rhetorick* (London, 1657), p. 55. Cf. Abraham Fraunce, *The Lawiers Logike* (London, 1588), p. 115r.

Donatus observed: "It is μίμησις. He passes from a mixed style to an imitative." Now Davus passes here from a simple relating of events to a mimicking of Glycerium's own words and actions. Evidently Donatus thought of narrative passages in comedy as not pure narrative, but as mixed; they were narrative and yet partly imitative because the author was after all putting words into the mouth of a character all the while. Upon at least one occasion Donatus came close to a conception of imitation as a dramatic representation of life created by the author, which is not quite the same thing as an aping of character by another character. In commenting on the somewhat garrulous exchanges of courtesies between old Laches and the courtesan Bacchis in the *Mother-in-law* 5.1.741, Donatus remarked: "Here is imitated a senile and womanish tediousness of speech." Here Terence is the imitator, not one of his characters. I am not quite sure just what Donatus did believe, but it seems fairly certain that his notion of imitation was closer to the Platonic interpretation than to Aristotle's wider meaning. *Mimesis* or *imitatio* usually meant the assimilation of the speaker to another character.

IX

The Terentian commentators did not have to go to Plato's *Republic* for this narrow meaning of imitation; they found it in the rhetorical discussions of *mimesis, prosopopoeia, prosographia, ethopoeia,* and *dialogismus.* All these terms were used more or less synonymously.[30] Quintilian (9.2.58) said: "The imitation of other persons' characteristics, which is styled *ethopoeia* or, as some prefer, *mimesis,* may be counted among the devices which serve to excite the gentler emotions; for it consists mainly in banter, though it may be concerned either with words or deeds." And Quintilian illustrated from the *Eunuch* (1.2.155-157) of Terence, where Phaedria mimics his mistress Thais. Barlandus, for one, quoted Quintilian on the passage, and doubtless all the commentators were familiar with the illustration. Although all the terms for imitation mentioned above were interchangeable, some rhetoricians tried to discriminate. Aphthonius[31] called *prosopopoeia* a kind of *ethopoeia,* specifically a portrait of manners such as Menander fashioned. Menander, of course, pointed straight to Terence. According to Professor Baldwin,[32] English school-boys were taught that in *prosopopoeia* the speaker feigns talking by himself, in *dialogismus* he feigns carrying on a dialogue by means of question and answer. The commentator Barlandus would support such a distinction; he called Phaedria's debating with himself in the *Eunuch* 1.1.46 a *dialogismus* and cited a Virgilian parallel in the *Aeneid* (4.534ff.), where Dido debates with herself. These rhetorical terms persisted for some time, long after Aristotle's broader conception of imitation became well known. Sir Philip Sidney, praising the poetry of David's Psalms, wrote, "His notable *prosopopoeias,* when he maketh you, as it were, see God coming in his majesty."[33] Sir John Harington took care to point out a *"pretty prosopoeia"* in the *Jerusalem Delivered* of Tasso.[34]

In addition to the technical concep-

[30] See Donatus, Latomus, and Willichius on the *Mother-in-law* 5.3.803; on the *Lady of Andros* 1.5.286.

[31] *Op. cit.,* p. 16v.

[32] *Op. cit.,* 2.233.

[33] *Defense of Poesie* (1595), in Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* 1.155.

[34] *Briefe Apologie of Poetrie* (1591), in *ibid.* 2.199.

tion of imitation as a rhetorical device particularly appropriate to comedy, there was the conception of imitation as the copying or emulation of models, best illustrated for the sixteenth century by Virgil's imitation of Homer, by Cicero's imitation of Demosthenes, and by Terence's imitation of Menander. Vida, in his *Art of Poetry* (1527), made famous this Virgilian kind of imitation that appropriates and refines upon the work of another author. Ben Jonson defined and practiced it as faithfully as any one: "The third requisite in our poet or maker is *imitation*, to be able to convert the substance or riches of another poet to his own use."[35] Cicero and Quintilian had strongly advocated the imitation of good authors as a necessary part of sound training in rhetoric. Horace had recommended the emulation of Greek authors. This notion of imitation, like *prosopopoeia*, persisted long after the Aristotelian imitation was well established.

Before the middle of the sixteenth century, scholars were beginning to quote Aristotle's statement in the *Physics* (2.2.194^{a}22), that "art imitates nature." After 1536, when the Latin version of the *Poetics* by Paccius appeared, there was an increasing acquaintance with Aristotle's more specific explanation of imitation. Imitation, according to Aristotle and the Aristotelian commentators, is the characteristic quality of the poet, who imitates by fabricating idealized representations of human beings in action. The sixteenth-century commentators and critics, by combining this Aristotelian imitation with theories found in Plato, Cicero, Horace, and Quintilian, arrived at a concept of imitation that closely corresponded to the traditional invention of logic and rhetoric. In fact, by the middle of the century, *imitatio*, *inventio*, *fictio*, and *fabula* were corollary terms, often used as synonyms.[36] Thus Lionardi, in 1554, could use imitation and invention interchangeably, and could say that invention is the "soul of all poetic imitation."[37] Long after the middle of the century *imitatio* and *inventio* continued to appear together in critical writings too numerous to mention. Examples from two of the most illustrious critics will suffice. Ronsard, in his *Brief on the Art of French Poetry* (1565), maintained that the "main point in poetry is invention, which comes as much from the right nature as from the lesson of good and ancient authors."[38] The aim of invention, said Ronsard, is to "represent, to describe, to imitate."[39] Sidney, in his *Defense of Poesie* (1595), raised a common question of the day, namely, whether or not a philosophical or historical poet, such as Lucretius or Lucan, is a "right poet" since he "takes not the free course of his own invention." Poetry, for Sidney, was an "art of imitation, for so Aristotle termeth it in his word *mimesis*, that is to say, a representing, counterfeiting, or figuring forth."[40]

But I am getting ahead of my story. In 1548, Robortellus brought imitation and invention together in a way that satisfactorily harmonized Aristotle's theory with the "learned imitator" (*imitator doctus*) of Horace and with the ideal orator of the rhetoricians. The ignorant man and the learned man, argued Robortellus, do not learn in the

[35] *Discoveries* (Bodley Head Quartos, London, 1923), p. 93.

[36] See my discussion of poetic imitation in the *Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism* (Urbana, 1946), pp. 28-38.

[37] Alessandro Lionardi, *Dialogi della inventione poetica* (Venice, 1554), p. 14.

[38] *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1914-1919) 7.45.

[39] *Ibid.* 7.50. Cf. Robortellus, who said the same thing in *In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes* (Florence, 1548), p. 2.

[40] Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* 1.158.

same way, although all men, as Aristotle said, delight in learning something and delight in viewing works of imitation. The common man who views a work of imitation, such as a picture or a carving, perceives only particulars, the particulars he has already experienced. The philosopher, however, applies universals to these particulars, for he is able to reason. The common man exercises reminiscence; the philosopher is also provided with *invention*.[41] Castelvetro, approaching the problem from the poet's point of view rather than from the spectator's, offered a similar interpretation. Although Castelvetro was opposed to imitation in the sense of copying ancient authors, he did approve of the right kind of imitation, which evidently was the same thing as poetic invention. In commenting on *Poetics* 9, wherein Aristotle asserted that the proper distinction between Homer the poet and Herodotus the historian is not that the one wrote in verse and the other in prose but rather that Homer exercised a creative faculty while Herodotus reported facts, Castelvetro said that the essence of poetry "consists in invention, and without invention there is no poet."[42] Versified history, said Castelvertro, is not poetry, for the mere versifier "endures no labor in invention; invention is the most difficult thing that the poet has to do, and it appears in that part from which he takes his name, that is, ποιητής."[43]

Castelvetro's statements on invention offer striking parallels to statements on imitation by other sixteenth-century scholars who were also following Aristotle. In *Poetics* 1, Aristotle argued that a poet is poet by reason of his imitation, not by reason of his meter, that Empedocles, though a versifier, was a physicist rather than a poet. Robortellus (p. 14) summed up the argument thus: "Homer imitates; therefore he is a poet. Empedocles does not imitate; . . . therefore he is not a poet." The sixteenth century could substitute "invents" for "imitates" and the meaning would remain the same; Lucretius, Lucan, Virgil (of the *Georgics*) could be substituted for Empedocles.[44]

X

The chief modern distinction between rhetoric and poetry, and between oratorical invention and poetic invention, is based upon this sixteenth-century interpretation of Aristotle's imitation. Robortellus (p. 2.), comparing the ends of rhetoric and poetry, came to the conclusion that it is imitation that distinguishes poetry, persuasion that distinguishes rhetoric:

> What other end, indeed, do we say the poetic faculty serves than to delight by means of representation, description, and imitation of all human actions, of all motions, of all matter both animate and inanimate? And since imitation or representation is done by means of speech, we say that the end of poetry is imitative discourse, as the end of rhetoric is persuasive discourse.

Then Robortellus proceeded to back this statement by quoting the Ciceronian definition of comedy—"the imitation of life, the mirror of custom, the image of truth" —which, he maintained, could be applied to all poetry.

This distinction, most clearly set forth by Robortellus, was not new at the time. Even before the revival of good Greek texts, with competent Latin translations,

[41] "Differt autem cognitio philosophi a cognitione illa vulgari, quoniam philosophus applicat vniuersale ad singularia, et sic colligit, ac recognoscit res ipsas; differt etiam, quoniam in philosopho inest vtraque cognitio, et quae per reminiscentiam, et ea simul, quae per inuentionem paratur; in vulgari autem homine est tantum reminiscentia." Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[42] *Poetica d'Aristotele* (Basle, 1576), p. 216.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[44] See Herrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-38.

Averroes had pointed out the same difference. Robortellus, by the way, knew a Latin version of Averroes' paraphrase of Aristotle's *Poetics,* and often referred to it. Averroes argued that rhetoric exercises its office "by means of imitative speech."[45] He emphatically insisted that persuasive speech is not becoming in poetic art, which should use speech that is "feigned and imitative"; in fact, he went so far as to assert that poetic art, especially tragedy, is not devised for argumentation and disputation.[46]

Most sixteenth-century schoolmasters, I suspect, would not have agreed with Averroes. Certainly Willichius, who found virtually every kind of argumentation and disputation in Terence, and who wanted schoolboys to find them, would not have agreed with him. Nor would Scaliger, who maintained, that philosopher, orator, and poet, "all have one and the same end—persuasion." This attitude, doubtless abetted by the prestige of Scaliger, was still prominent in the next century. Fenelon, in his dialogues on elequence, said:

> C. But if true Orators be Poets, I should think that Poets are Orators, too; for Poetry is very proper to persuade.
>
> A. Yes; they have the very same end.[47]

Then speaker A went on to remind his companions of Cicero's comparison of the orator with the poet. The belief that oratory and poetry were essentially the same, that the poet differed from the orator only in his being restricted in his "numbers," persisted for a long time. Late in the eighteenth century, George Campbell could say that "poetry indeed is properly no other than a particular mode or form of certain branches of oratory."[48] Versification, Campbell believed, was merely an appendage, not a constituent of poetry. In 1800, we may recall, Wordsworth could say that the language of poetry differed in no essential way from the language of prose. Coleridge, to be sure, tried to set Wordsworth right, and since the publication of the *Biographia Literaria* many critics have come to hold that verse is much more than an appendage, that it is essential to poetic form.

There was little or no disagreement in the sixteenth century, however, on the importance of imitation in poetry, especially in dramatic poetry. There was little disagreement, moreover, that this poetic imitation was largely a making of fiction. In the eyes of most scholars and critics of the time, this imitation, this making of a fiction, was what chiefly characterized the poet.[49] I have already shown that Averroes promoted this theory. Robortellus (p. 2) restated it as well as any:

> Since, therefore, poetry must use feigned speech for its matter, it is plain that poetry should fitly contrive fable and false tale; in no other art is the mingling of false tales more characteristic than in this one. According to Aristotle,[50] Homer, from whom all poetry has been derived, first taught how a lie should be fitly expressed.

During the Renaissance, and long afterward, invention remained the first quality necessary to the good orator and the good poet. The orator exercised his invention by discovering arguments, proofs, testimony. The poet exercised his invention, which was peculiarly imitative, by imitating nature in general and human actions in particular; he feigned and counterfeited, he made fictions.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 361.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 362.
[47] *Dialogues Concerning Eloquence,* translated by Wm. Stevenson (London, 1722), p. 80.
[48] *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London, 1776) 1.14.

[49] Scaliger, though he believed in imitation, did object to the grading of poets according to their imitative powers. He maintained, contrary to the majority of leading critics, that a poet is a poet because he writes verses. See *Poetices* 1.2.
[50] See *Poetics* 24. 60a19.

Both orator and poet aimed to teach, delight, and move. The orator put the main emphasis upon persuading his audience. The poet put the main emphasis upon delighting his. The poet, as Sidney said, "cometh unto you with a tale which holdeth children from play, and old men from the chimney-corner."

XI

As I have remarked at the beginning of this chapter, the conventional quantitative analysis of any formal speech or writing was borrowed from forensic rhetoric: exordium, *narratio*, proof, conclusion. Sometimes partition and disproof were added to the list of parts. There were some attempts in the sixteenth century to make a whole comedy, from prologue through protasis and epitasis to castrophe, fit this rhetorical plan. Generally, however, the commentators were happier in analyzing individual scenes. Thus Willichius seldom discussed the exordium of a whole play; rather he would discuss the numerous exordia that appeared in the scenes. Again Aristotle pointed the way to a consideration of the composition as an organic whole, and once his *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* became better known more attention was given to the pattern of the whole comedy.

Aristotle, in the *Rhetoric* (3.14.1-6), remarked that the "exordium is the beginning of a speech, as the prologue in poetry and the prelude in flute-playing." The exordia of forensic speeches ought to produce the same effect as do dramatic prologues and epic exordia; their special function is to make clear what is the end or purpose of the composition. Long before modern publication of the *Rhetoric*, Averroes, in his paraphrase, had called attention to the similarity between the exordia of orators and poets: "Not only orators use this, but also poets, both those who make use of praise and other kinds of poets."[51]

This view of the exordium was commonly held in ancient times. Donatus, who probably had no direct acquaintance with either the *Rhetoric* or *Poetics* of Aristotle, argued that the author of a comedy should use the opening of his play to inform the audience about the origin and the end of his plot:

> This order and compass of poetic art or power, not only the tragic and comic authors have followed, but also Homer and Virgil have held to.[52]

Donatus thought that the main function of the prologue was to narrate the argument. He recognized that the Terentian prologue is not an integral part of the main action. At all events, he praised Terence for the lively opening, i.e. Act 1, Scene 1, of the *Lady of Andros*:

> This scene, in which the grounds of the story (*fabula*) are set forth, is offered in place of a narration of the argument, so that by virtue of the poet and without the service of prologue or "gods out of the machine" people may obtain a summary of the comedy and the matter may be seen acted rather than narrated.[53]

Certainly the typical Roman prologue in comedy did not fulfill Aristotelian requirements, as Robortellus pointed out. Robortellus showed that the Roman prologue, which was usually a mere appendage, "something short and trifling," is different from the Aristotelian ideal of prologue as an integral part of the play.[54] The principles that traditionally governed the making of an exordium were therefore applied to the opening

[51] "Non agunt hoc solum oratores, sed etiam ipsi poetae, et qui utuntur laudatione, et qui sunt aliarum specierum poetarum." *Aristotelis . . . opera . . . Averrois Cordubensis in ea opera omnes qui ad nos pervenere commentarii. . . .* (Venice, 1550-1552) 2.63v.

[52] Preface to his commentary on the *Lady of Andros*.

[53] On *Lady of Andros* 1.1.28.

[54] See Robortellus, *Explicatio eorum omnium, quae ad comoediae artificium pertinent* (Venice, 1548), pp. 42-43.

scenes of the play proper rather than to the Terentian prologue. Commentators like Willichius, to be sure, managed to find exordia of some sort or other in almost every scene.

Mainly for introduction, the exordium should not be too emotional; the best place for strong emotional appeal is in the conclusion. According to Quintilian (4.1.5), the author best prepares for receptive listening by making his audience well disposed, attentive, and ready to learn. Donatus, as I have shown above, found a good illustration in the opening scene of the *Lady of Andros*. Later commentators found another admirable illustration in the opening scene of the *Self-Tormentor*, where Chremes tries, and successfully, to win the confidence of his crotchety neighbor Menedemus so that he may help him overcome his domestic troubles.

The exordium of Roman comedy, then, does not correspond to the Roman prologue; it appears in the opening scene, or scenes, of the play. The exordium of comedy, in fact, overlaps with the next quantitative part, the *narratio;* often it is impossible to determine just what is exordium and what *narratio*.

XII

The commentators on Terence used the term *narratio* in two ways: first they applied it to the necessary statement of the main argument or to any statement of facts in any scene; secondly they applied it to any narrative passage which might occur anywhere in the five acts. Generally speaking, *narratio*, when applied to comedy, meant either the statement of facts in a particular scene or merely a narrative passage as opposed to the give-and-take of rapid dialogue. Exposition (*expositio*), which nowadays means the necessary explanation of the background of action and character, was apparently used in the sixteenth century, as indeed it was used by the author of the *Ad Herennium* and by Quintilian,[55] interchangeably with *narratio*. Perhaps one commentator, Latomus, did mean to distinguish between *narratio* and *expositio*. Latomus, on the argument of the *Eunuch* 3.5. (549ff.), called Chaerea's account of his amorous adventure in the house of Thais the "exposition of the protasis of the other part of the play"—i.e. the exposition of the protasis of the sub-plot. But he called Dorias' account of the quarrel between Thais and Thraso, in the *Eunuch* 4.1 (615ff.), the *narratio* of the occasion of the epitasis in the main action. Did Latomus apply *expositio* only to the *protasis*, namely the first division of the plot, and thus anticipate our present-day use of the term exposition? I can not be sure. Unfortunately Willichius does not help much. Willichius did remark that in the *Phormio* 1.2 (57ff.) the poet has come to the "exposition of the argument," and this is the protasis of the play. On the other hand, Willichius referred to the whole scene as *narratio*: "Here is the *narratio*, in which the argument of the play is set forth (*exponitur*)." Although it is tempting to argue that *expositio*, in the sixteenth century, was coming to mean the statement of facts in the protasis, thus directly pointing to our present-day "exposition" in drama, I do not now have sufficient evidence to support such a claim, likely as it appears. Certainly *narratio* was a much commoner term in the century than *expositio*, whether applied to the "exposition" of the whole action, to the "exposition" of individual scenes, or merely to narrative passages.

[55] See Quintilian, 3.9.7; 4.2.2. *Ad Herennium* 1.3.4 reads as follows: "Narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut proinde ut gestarum exposito." Cf. Cicero, *De Inventione* 1.19.

The classical rhetorical rules for constructing a *narratio,* which the commentators found exemplified in the comedies of Terence, are better discussed in a later chapter on plot. I shall mention here only one important observation that Donatus contributed. Donatus, who had a keen appreciation of the dramatic, called attention to the skillful way in which Terence diversifies his *narratio* in the *Mother-in-law* 1.2 (104.131) by means of many pleasing by-plays of character and by shifting from narrative to *mimesis.* This observation, which had sound Ciceronian authority,[56] is consistent with the best oratorical and dramatic practice. Convenient illustrations may be observed in the early comedies of Shakespeare. The *narratio* in the *Comedy of Errors,* for example, consists of long narrative speeches by old Aegeon, only rarely broken by remarks from the Duke. The *narratio* in the opening scene of the more mature *Midsummer Night's Dream,* however, is diversified by lively by-plays of character and by rapid dialogue.

XIII

The third quantitative element, proof (*confirmatio*), played an important part in many commentators' analyses of Terence. Willichius was the most indefatigable; seldom did he fail to find examples of proof or disproof in a scene. Furthermore, from the rhetorician's point of view, the use of proof in any discourse, oratorical or poetic, furnished the critics with an important basis for artistic evaluation. Aristotle and Quintilian classified proofs as "inartificial" and "artificial"; the artificial proofs were superior since they represented the author's own invention.[57] Donatus and his followers applied this division into artificial and inartificial proofs to the Terentian comedies and judged the artistic merits of some scenes on this basis. There are numerous illustrations; perhaps the best are Donatus on the *Brothers* 3.4.478, and Willichius on the *Lady of Andros* 2.2.359. Nevertheless, while it was easy to find many examples of proof and disproof in Terence, it was difficult to square this third quantitative part of a forensic oration with the third part of a comedy. In other words, proof or disproof as a quantitative element did not fit the pattern of comedy very well; the epitasis is not one long proof or even a consistent series of proofs or disproofs. Averroes had pointed out a real difficulty when he said that poetry is not devised primarily for argumentation and disputation. Aristotle, however, in *Poetics* 19, had mentioned proof as a legitimate part of the intellectual element (διάνοια) in tragedy, and suggested that it properly belongs to the art of rhetoric. Therefore, in time, this phenomenon of proof and disproof in the drama, tragedy or comedy, along with the whole process of reasoning and arguing, was shifted in dramatic criticism from the quantitative scheme of oratory to the Aristotelian qualitative scheme of dramatic poetry, where it fitted the third qualitative element of Thought or Sentiment. Consequently I shall reserve my detailed discussion of the use of proofs, of syllogisms and enthymemes, in Terentian comedy for a later chapter on sentiment and diction.

Any detailed discussion of the conclusion, the peroration, the epilogue, will be postponed to the chapter on plot.

[56] "A *narratio* is delightful moreover which has surprises, suspense, and unexpected issues, mingled with human emotions, dialogues between persons, grief, rage, fear, joy, and desire." *Partitiones Oratoriae* 9.32.

[57] See Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.2.2; Quintilian, 5.1.1; 5.8-9.

A few general observations on conclusion will have to suffice at this point.

XIV

The peroration of a speech, according to Quintilian (6.1.1-2), may deal with either facts (*res*) or emotions. The speaker may repeat his facts in order to refresh the memory of the judge, and he may make his final emotional appeal. Cicero[58] divided the peroration into three parts: (1) the reckoning up, (2) the arousing of indignation, (3) the arousing of pity. When applied to poetry, Cicero's division obviously fits tragedy and the epic poem better than it does comedy. Nevertheless, the adjustment to comedy was not difficult; comedy also has its reckoning up or recapitulation in the catastrophe; it substitutes good humor for indignation, and laughter for pity.

Actually, the commentators on Terence paid little attention to perorations in the plays, doubtless because the pattern of New Comedy was firmly set and all conclusions were similar; they were happy settlements of domestic troubles and happy reunitings of quarreling families and neighbors. Willichius, to be sure, occasionally pointed out a good illustration of peroration in a particular speech or at the end of a particular scene.[59] But the usual conclusion of a scene in Terence is a transition or preparation (*παρασκευή*) for the next scene. Only one traditional principle for making a good conclusion calls for special comment here. Quintilian had insisted that the conclusion be as brief as possible.[60] I suspect that this rhetorical rule, which must have been hammered into the heads of many schoolboys in the Renaissance, helps to explain a rather common phenomenon in the comic drama of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, namely the hurried conclusions. Every student of the drama must have observed it, often in notable plays.

XV

The traditional plans then, of analyzing literature, whether oratorical or poetic, were two: the qualitative (invention, disposition, style, memory, delivery) and the quantitative (exordium, *narratio*, proof, conclusion). With the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Poetics* in the sixteenth century it was inevitable that sooner or later the traditional rhetorical analysis and Aristotle's poetic analysis would come together, that the two methods, the rhetorical and the poetic, would either be fused or one be raised in importance over the other. So far as I can make out, both these results obtained; the rhetorical and the poetic methods of analyzing literature were fused and in time the Aristotelian analysis by means of plot, character, thought, and diction emerged triumphant in the study of dramatic and epic poetry, in the study of novel and short story.

Robortellus, in 1548, was the first to place these analyses side by side. He paralleled Aristotle's qualitative analysis of tragedy, which also applied to epic poetry and to comedy, with the rhetorical qualitative analysis, enumerating the parts in the reverse of their intrinsic importance:

> And there are Spectacle, Music, next Diction, Thought, Character, Plot. Just so in rhetoric, if you proceed in the same order, there will be the constituent parts, Delivery, Memory, Style, Disposition, Invention.[61]

[58] *De Inventione* 1.52-55. Cf. Trapezuntius, *op. cit.*, pp. 87ff.

[59] See Willichius on the *Brothers* 1.2.123; *ibid.* 4.3.608.

[60] 6.1.2. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.13.3; 3.19.4.

[61] "Sunt autem Apparatus, Melodia. Deinceps vero Dictio, Sententia, Mores, Fabula. Sicuti etiam in Rhetorice, si eodem ordine progrediaris. Sic erunt partes constituendae, Pronunciatio, Memoria, Elocutio, Dispositio, Inventio." Commentary, p. 56.

Robortellus found that not only were the qualitative parts parallel, but that the Aristotelian quantitative parts of dramatic poetry corresponded to the quantitative parts of rhetoric:

> In the rhetorical faculty the same kind of parts have been called by the rhetoricians Invention, Disposition, Style, Memory, Delivery. So in the poetic faculty, Plot (to which are joined Discovery, Peripety, Perturbation), Character, Thought, and the rest. It should be understood that these are the parts that belong to the form, that are exercised in the very mind of the artist. There are other parts, moreover, within the work itself, that are ascribed to the quantity. Such in rhetoric, to be sure, are Exordium, Narratio, Partition, Proof, Disproof, Conclusion. Likewise, such in poetry are Prologue, Episode, Exode, Chorus.[62]

Aristotle's quantitative division of a play into prologue, episodes, choral interludes, and exode was squared, in the sixteenth century, with Donatus' scheme of prologue, protasis, epitasis and catastrophe, and with the five-act formula worked out by Terentian commentators.[63]

Robortellus very wisely did not push this parallel between rhetorical and poetic analysis too far. The sets of parts do not fit each other exactly. While invention corresponds pretty closely to the *fictio* in a poetic plot (*fabula*), disposition, in the sense of organizing the structure of the whole work, also corresponds to Aristotle's conception of plot as the combination of incidents, the *σύνθεσις τῶν πραγμάτων*, the *rerum constitutio*. And where does Character (*mores*) fit the rhetorical scheme; does it correspond to invention or to disposition, or to both? Where does Thought fit? Scaliger,[64] who said that the poet must exercise invention, form, and ornament, placed character and thought under both invention and ornament. It was hardly necessary, however, to make the oratorical and poetic analyses fit each other precisely; the important achievement was the fusion of the two, with the result that literary criticism gained new terms and new aids.

Critics following Robortellus elaborated on his demonstration of the parallel between rhetorical and poetic analysis. Minturno[65] drew wordy comparisons between oratory and poetry. Of course he believed that invention, disposition, and style are required of the poet as well as of the orator. Delivery and memory, he acknowledged, are necessary to the actor rather than to the poet, and correspond to spectacle and music, which are accessories to the art of the poet. Plot, character, thought, and diction, to be sure, correspond to invention, disposition, and style. Minturno also presented a rather elaborate discussion of the quantitative parts of poetry. First he analyzed *principium* (i.e. exordium) and *narratio*. He adopted the Platonic division of *narratio* into three classes: (1) simple—e.g. lyric poetry; (2) imitative—e.g. tragedy and comedy; (3) mixed—e.g. heroic poetry. He tried to make a distinction between rhetorical and poetic *narratio*. The rhetorical *narratio* should make known what is in the debate; the poetic *narratio* should make known what is in the plot (*fabula*). Then he proceeded to show why the poet must be able to divide, to prove, to disprove, and to conclude; in

[62] "In Rhetorica facultate hae quoque a Rhetoribus partes eiusmodi vocatae fuerunt, Inventio, Dispositio, Elocutio, Memoria, Pronunciatio. Sic in facultate poetica, Fabula, cui annexae sunt Agnitio, Peripetia, Perturbatio, Mores, Sententia et reliquae. Sciendum vero partes has, quae formam respiciunt, in ipsa artificis mente versari; partes autem alias, quae ad quantitatem referuntur; in ipso opere, quales enim in Rhetorice sunt Exordium, Narratio, Partitio, Confirmatio, Confutatio, Conclusio. tales quoque in poetice sunt, Prologus, Episodium, Exodus, Choricum." (p. 117.)

[63] See T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, 1946).

[64] *Poetices* 1.11.

[65] See *De Poeta*, pp. 108-109, 111, 119.

other words, the poet, like the orator, must be trained in the use of partition, proof, disproof, and conclusion.

Castelvetro, very probably influenced by Robortellus, also stated the parallel between rhetoric and poetry, and more succinctly than did Minturno:

> These parts [plot, character, thought, diction, spectacle, music], which Aristotle calls the qualitative parts and which ought to be taken as qualities of tragedy, have that place in poetry that they hold in rhetoric—invention, disposition, diction, delivery, and memory, which likewise are qualitative parts of the oration (*diceria*) and so qualities of the oration, the oration making use of each of these five parts. Since, moreover, there are quantitative parts of the oration in rhetoric, exordium, *narratio*, proposition, proof, disproof, and conclusion, not otherwise there are quantitative parts of tragedy in poetry, which Aristotle has named prologue, incoming chorus, episode, stationary chorus, episode, stationary chorus, episode, stationary chorus, exode.[66]

Notice that Castelvetro was careful to make his Aristotelian quantitative parts of tragedy fit the Roman five-acts; there are three episodes, preceded by a prologue and followed by the exode.

Robortellus, Minturno, and Castelvetro, all influential critics in the Renaissance, made a synthesis of the established principles of rhetorical art and the rediscovered Aristotelian principles of poetic art. As a result the rhetorical analysis and the poetic analysis became virtually inextricable, as they are today. By the seventeenth century, critics were freely using the terms invention and disposition along with plot, character, and sentiment, passing from one set to another or mingling the two sets. Rymer's translation of Rapin, the French critic who strongly influenced leading English critics of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, reads:

> The art of poetry in general comprehends the matters of which a poet treats and the manner in which he handles them; the invention, the contrivance, the design, the proportion and symmetry of parts, the general disposition of matters, and whatever regards the invention, belong to the matters of which this art ought to treat. The fable, the manners, the sentiments, the words, the figures, the numbers, the harmony, the versification regard the manner in which the matters are to be handled.[67]

Dryden used both the rhetorical and poetic schemes in his literary criticism, sometimes combining the two. Dryden in fact, provides a typical and admirable illustration of the evolution of the critical methods developed during the sixteenth century. For example, he took exception to Hobbes' emphasis upon diction as the first element in epic poetry. Diction, of course, comes third in the rhetorical qualitative analysis, after invention and disposition. In Aristotle's qualitative analysis of poetry, diction comes fourth, after plot, character, and thought. Therefore Dryden answered Hobbes, "The design, the disposition, the manners, and the thoughts, are all before it."[68] By "design" Dryden meant invention. The speakers in Dryden's dialogue on dramatic theory, the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668), examined plot, character, sentiment, and diction, and spoke of protasis, epitasis, catastrophe, and the five-act structure. When Dryden wrote his excellent comparison of Chaucer with Ovid in the *Preface to the Fables* (1700), he judged these two poets according to their invention, manners (characters), thoughts, and diction. When he compared Chaucer with Boccaccio, in the same essay, he discussed invention and disposition. Ovid, Boccaccio, and Chaucer, to be sure, were not playwrights. The Aristotelian scheme of plot, character, thought, and diction was most suitable to criticism of tragedy and comedy and epic poetry, though it was

[66] *Op. cit.*, pp. 257-258.

[67] Rapin, *Reflections on Aristotle's Treatise of Poesie* (London, 1674), pp. 23-24.

[68] *Preface to the Fables*, in *Essays*, edited by Ker (Oxford, 1926) 2.252.

useful in criticizing other kinds of poetry as well. The rhetorical terms were still very useful, especially in criticizing non-dramatic poetry. The development of novel and short story in the next two centuries was destined to extend the province of Aristotelian criticism even farther beyond the limits of drama and epic poem.

XVI

Invention, disposition, and style, along with exordium, *narratio,* proof, and conclusion, served the theory and practice of both oratory and poetry for centuries, and these terms still live, even outside the classroom in public speaking. The addition of Aristotle's division of dramatic and epic poetry into plot, character, thought, and diction, along with the quantitative parts (prologue, episodes, exode) and the Renaissance five-act formula, greatly enriched literary criticism during the sixteenth century. For general purposes, and for the schoolroom, the traditional rhetoric was long considered the most useful. Invention and disposition were broader terms than plot, character, and thought, and could be more generally applied. For the majority of compositions in prose or verse, whether orations, essays, epistles, dramatic scenes, or lyric poems, the analysis into exordium, *narratio,* proof, and conclusion was the usual practice. Willichius knew what he was doing when he prepared his edition of Terence. If he had been better acquainted with the *Poetics* of Aristotle—he did know the work[69]—if he had studied Robortellus' masterly interpretation of the treatise, he might have greatly enriched his criticism of Terence as, later on, Dryden enriched his criticism of Jonson, Ovid, and Chaucer. As it was, Willichius at least presented a practical method of studying dramatic poetry. Classical rhetoric was, after all, the solid basis of literary criticism in the sixteenth century, and classical rhetoric laid the foundations of the literary criticism of succeeding centuries. Modern theories of the drama, including modern theories of comedy, were shaped by the Aristotelian theory of poetry plus classical rhetorical theory, and the classical rhetoric came first.

[69] See his *Commentaria in artem poeticam Horatii* (Strassburg, 1539).

QUINTILIAN AND THE GOOD ORATOR

EARNEST BRANDENBURG

WRITERS of textbooks in Speech, when they comment on the subject, seem agreed that the liar, the cheat, the blackmailer, the fraud, cannot be acknowledged a great orator.[1] The highest excellence in public speaking is not a specialized skill which a person can acquire and use, regardless of his moral character, as one might acquire proficiency in shoemaking or painting. Although lip service is paid to this principle, a survey of modern rhetorical criticism indicates that little thought has been given to the way in which the concept affects the rhetorical critic. Straightforward answers to the following questions should not be avoided. Is it the task of the rhetorical critic to appraise the moral character of the speaker? What should be the critic's standards in such judgments?

The Aristotelean concept of Ethical Proof,[2] resulting from the personality and conduct of the speaker at the time of the speech and from the references in the speech which tend to establish his character in the minds of the audience, is commonly accepted. Most people agree that a speaker's success in a given situation depends significantly upon the opinion of his character which the audience has or acquires. But should the rhetorical critic in evaluating a speaker look at his actual *character* as well as his *reputation*? Must the "good orator" be a "good man"? Is high moral and ethical character a requisite for great speakers?

Does the Task of the Rhetorical Critic Include An Appraisal of the Moral Character of the Speaker?

No rhetorician has emphasized more than Quintilian the concept that the orator must be a "good man." He asserted:

> Let the orator, then, whom I propose to form, be such a one as is characterized by the definition of Marcus Cato, a good man skilled in speaking.[3] . . . I not only say that he who would answer my idea of an orator must be a good man, but that no man, unless he be good, can ever be an orator.[4]

He also defined what he meant by a "good man."

> . . . The orator must above all things study *morality*, and must obtain a thorough knowledge of all that is just and honourable, without which no one can either be a good man or an able speaker.[5]

He illustrated his requirements for virtue by discussing the necessity of know-

EARNEST BRANDENBERG *is Instructor in Speech at the State University of Iowa.*

[1] See, for example: William Norwood Brigance, *Speech Composition* (1945), p. 141; Robert T. Oliver, *Training For Effective Speech* (1939), pp. 63-66; James A. Winans, *Speech Making* (1938), pp. 378-403.

[2] "Of the means of persuasion supplied by the speech itself there are three kinds. The first kind resides in the character [ethos] of the speaker. . . . The character [ethos] of the speaker is a cause of persuasion when the speech is so uttered as to make him worthy of belief. . . . This trust . . . should be created by the speech itself.

". . . In conducing to persuasion it is highly important that the speaker should evince a certain character, and that the judges should conceive him to be disposed toward them in a certain way, and further, if possible, that the judges themselves should have a certain attitude towards him. . . . As for the speakers themselves, the sources of our trust in them are three, for apart from the arguments [in a speech] there are three things that gain our belief, namely, intelligence, character, and good will." Lane Cooper, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (1932), pp. 8, 91-92.

[3] Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory*, Translated by John S. Watson (London, 1891), II, 391.

[4] *Ibid.*, 392.

[5] *Ibid.*, 402.

ing what "temperance is," of examining "what is equitable and good," of being "just."[6]

Other classical rhetoricians did not stress the "good man" doctrine as did Quintilian, but nonetheless they accepted it. The idea of "goodness" or virtue underlies Aristotle's whole approach to oratory. His four uses of rhetoric give a clue to the nearness of his position to that of Quintilian.[7] Aristotle defined "good" at some length and presented a long list of "goods."[8] A discussion of what is "noble," and a consideration of the elements of "virtue"[9] were also included in the *Rhetoric*. Aristotle's position, although not stated so directly, is clearly with Quintilian's.

Cicero's famous work, *De Oratore*, bears the sub-title *On the Character of the Orator*. As he vigorously advocated broad knowledge for orators, Cicero indicated that the man who possesses the required understanding and intelligence for praiseworthy oratory will also be one who both appears good and is good.

> It is of peculiar advantage that indications of good nature, of liberality, of gentleness, of piety, of grateful feelings, free from selfishness and avarice, should appear in him.[10]

Cicero was concerned not only with the appearance of good but also with the actual character of the speaker, for he made equally clear that

> it contributes much to success in speaking, that the morals, principles, conduct, and lives of those who plead causes, and of those for whom they plead, should be such as to merit esteem.[11]

Plato condemned the "rhetoricians" of his day because they failed to meet his standards of character ἦθος. He deplored their "false rhetoric" with such specific indictments as:

> The whole of which rhetoric is a part is not an art at all, but the habit of a bold and ready wit, which knows how to manage mankind; this habit I sum up under the word flattery.[12]

Yet, if a man was to speak, Plato would have him know the truth. "He, who does not know the truth . . . will produce but a ridiculous and inartistic art of speaking."[13] In fact, his ruling principle was that the supreme business of life is to "tend" the soul, to make it as good as possible, and his conviction was that "goodness of soul" means knowledge of good and evil.[14] Plato would agree that if there are to be orators and if there are to be critics of those orators (which, of course, would not be the case in his perfect state),[15] then the moral character of the speaker is significant.

Although some of the sophists taught simply a bag of tricks, designed and advertised as an easy guide to eloquence, Isocrates and others considered virtue an essential element of the rhetorician's

[6] *Ibid.*, 403, 404.

[7] "[A proper knowledge and exercise of Rhetoric would prevent the triumph of fraud and injustice.] Secondly, [Rhetoric is valuable as a means of instruction]. . . . Thirdly, . . . we should be able to argue on either side of a question; not with a view to putting both sides into practice—we must not advocate evil—but in order that no aspect of the case may escape us, and that if our opponent makes unfair use of the arguments, we may be able in turn to refute them. . . . Lastly, if it is a disgrace to a man when he cannot defend himself in a bodily way, it would not be odd to think him disgraced when he cannot defend himself with reason [in a speech]." Cooper, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6. (Brackets as used by Cooper.)

[8] The following are included: happiness, health, beauty, wealth, friends, friendship, honor, reputation, natural ability, "all the sciences and art." *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

[10] *Cicero On Oratory and Orators*, "De Oratore," Translated by John S. Watson (London, 1862), p. 271.

[11] *Loc. cit.*

[12] *Dialogues of Plato*, "Gorgias," Translated by B. Jowett (1892), I, 521.

[13] *The Works of Plato*, "Phaedrus," Translated by Henry Cary (London, 1854), I, 340.

[14] Alfred Edward Taylor, "Plato, The Earlier Dialogues," *Encyclopedia Brittanica* (Chicago, 1946), XVIII, 51.

[15] For a discussion of the inevitable conflicts between the common conceptions of rhetoric and Plato's desired state, see Everett Lee Hunt, "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and the Rhetoricians," *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans* (1925), p. 22.

teaching.[16] Isocrates wrote the *Antidosis* to tell the "truth" about his own character. He was most anxious to disprove that he "corrupted young men by teaching them to speak and gain their own advantage in the courts contrary to justice."[17] He contended that

> . . . men who are in public life . . . must adopt the principle of doing what is most serviceable and noble and of saying what is most true and just.[18]

Greek and Roman rhetoricians clearly prescribed that the orator be a "good" man.[19] As later rhetoricians have drawn heavily for ideas upon the classical writers, we would expect them to advocate a similar philosophy for the speaker. The attitudes of Edmund Burke,[20] Hugh Blair,[21] and John Quincy Adams,[22] supporting the idea that the orator must be a good man, illustrate the significance given to the concept in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by capable rhetorical theorists.

Present-day rhetorical critics frequently evaluate orators in regard to their moral character, and rank them higher in oratorical ability if they meet Quintilian's "good man" standards.[23]

The practice of rhetoricians through the years, then, would seem to support the belief that the task of the rhetorical critic most certainly does include an estimate of the moral character of the speaker.

What Will Be the Critic's Standards in Judging the Moral Character of the Speaker?

The question is not so simple as the following statement might seem to indicate:

> What we most need to know about any man is surely this: whether he is good or bad. To be sure, we seldom put the question so crudely. Indeed we often affect a scorn for mere goodness, persuading ourselves that we are more concerned with a man's breeding, his intellectual vigor, his artistic skill, or his practical efficiency, but in the end we all admit, implicitly or explicitly, that we are more deeply interested in his honesty, his courage and his justice—in a word, in his goodness—than in his intellectual or creative endowment, his upbringing, or his possessions.[24]

Standards for the judgment of moral character must be established. But philosophers are in vigorous disagreement regarding the method of determining such criteria. The two extreme views are held by the "ethical relativists" and the "ethical absolutists." The "relativists" argue

[16] See Hoyt H. Hudson, "The Field of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, IX (1923), 167-80, for a discussion of virtue as a part of the sophists' beliefs.

[17] *Isocrates With An English Translation by George Norlin*, "Antidosis," (London, 1929), II, 203, 223.

[18] *Ibid.*, 261.

[19] The various ancients' definitions of "good," in this connection, varied. Probably they can best be considered as "rationalists," however, for they generally believed reason sufficient to determine what is good or evil, right or wrong, more or less independently of actual experience. Abraham Wolf, "Ethics—The Knowledge of Good and Evil," *Encyclopedia Brittanica* (Chicago, 1946), VIII, 760.

Modern use of the word "good" as an adjective applied to persons has "reference to moral character, disposition, or conduct, [meaning] morally excellent or commendable, . . . virtuous." *New English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1901), IV, 288.

[20] Burke's philosophy of oratory contained the idea that "the orator should be a good man, learned in all phases of his subject, speaking well, and on the right side of the question." Donald C. Bryant, "Edmund Burke on Oratory," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIX (1933), 1-6.

[21] Hugh Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (London, 1823), p. 381.

[22] Adams did take issue with Quintilian's statement that none but an honest man could be an orator. However, in Adam's view, character was the most important kind of proof. He thought moral qualities were of greater importance to a speaker than intellect or emotion. J. Q. Adams, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* (Cambridge, 1810), I, 363-64. Horace G. Rahskopf, *John Quincy Adam's Theory and Practice of Public Speaking*, Ph.D. Thesis (State University of Iowa, 1935), p. 23.

[23] See, for example: Roy C. McCall, "Theodore S. Parker," *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, Editor, William Norwood Brigance (1943), I, 243; Marie Hochmuth and Norman Mattis, "Phillips Brooks," *Ibid.*, 324; and, Karl R. Wallace, "Booker T. Washington," *Ibid.*, 420.

[24] Mary Whiton Calkins, *The Good Man and the Good* (1918), p. 1.

that man's views of what is right and what is wrong have varied from time to time and from place to place; hence, morality is merely a matter of opinion. Moral right means only what people think is morally right. What Hindus think right is, therefore, right for Hindus. Values are entirely subjective. What is right at one time or place is wrong at another time or place, since no universally objective standards are valid. A study of folkways throughout history led William G. Sumner to state, "Mores can make anything right and prevent condemnation of anything."[25] Edward Westermarck concludes his book on ethical relativity with the statement:

> Moral consciousness is ultimately based on emotions, . . . the moral judgment lacks objective validity, . . . moral values are not absolute but relative to the emotions they express.[26]

On the other hand, the "ethical absolutists" would have us believe:

> There is but one eternally true and valid moral code. This moral code applies with rigid impartiality to all men. . . . And this will be true whether you are an Englishman, a Chinaman, or a Hottentot. If cannibalism is an abomination in England or America, it is an abomination in Central Africa, notwithstanding that the African may think otherwise. The fact that he sees nothing wrong in his cannibalistic practices does not make them for him morally right. . . . There is but one law, one standard, one morality, for all men. And this standard, this law, is absolute and unvarying.[27]

The rhetorician, quite obviously, is most reluctant to align himself with either of these extreme views. But the mere difficulty of evolving a philosophy does not obviate his responsibility. The author of this paper believes the modern rhetorician should take a middle ground which, admittedly, leaves much to be desired as an absolutely defensible tenet. But, the importance, the necessity, of evaluating the character of the orator demands that some sort of working approach be established.

What theories can the rhetorician accept? The "ethical absolutists" and the "relativists" agree, apparently, that a particular society's moral code cannot be called the one true code. The "absolutists" do not deny that "humanity has still much to learn in moral matters";[28] hence, the following view of the "relativists" seems sound for the rhetorician:

> That the ethical like the legal code of a people stands in need of constant revision will hardly be disputed by any attentive and dispassionate observer. The view that the principles of right and wrong are immutable and eternal is no longer tenable. The moral world is as little exempt as the physical world from the law of ceaseless change, of perpetual flux.[29]

What are, then, some specific qualities which will help in the judgment of the orator's "goodness"?

The rhetorical critic must draw the distinction between character and reputation, between good and the appearance of being good. The quotations from Plato, Quintilian, Isocrates, and Cicero which were given earlier show that the ancients firmly subscribed to this principle. Modern philosophers also agree; they, too, advise that there are those who may seem to

> have every appearance of being honest, fair, kind and charitable . . . [and yet] are bad men in spite of their outward respectability and success.[30]

The rhetorician must be able to recognize such instances. Usually, the task is simplified because mankind has "an uncanny gift for penetrating disguises and for seeing . . . the inner secrets of a man's character."[31]

[25] William G. Sumner, *Folkways* (Boston, 1907), p. 521.
[26] Edward Westermarck, *Ethical Relativity* (London, 1932), p. 289.
[27] Walter T. Stace, *The Concept of Morals* (1937), pp. 1, 2.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[29] James George Frazer, *Man, God and Immortality* (1927), p. 183.
[30] Stace, *op. cit.*, pp. 203, 204.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

The sincerity and integrity of the speaker must be weighed. Deception tends to undermine social relationships. The counterfeiter not only injures the person who receives his spurious money and is unable to use it, but also he brings sound money under suspicion and injures society. Failure to be truthful[32] "tends to invalidate the truth and to cast doubt and suspicion upon the intellectual medium of exchange."[33] The rhetorical critic will be guided in his judgment of the moral character of the speaker by his realization of the desirability of truthfulness. Of course, the problem is "[not] . . . solved by the simple rejection of each and every lie."[34] Perhaps the speaker has faced the alternative of sacrificing one value or another. "In some cases the selection of the greater value may mean the temporary denial of the obligation of truthfulness."[35] This seeming paradox can be better understood when accepted in terms of another concept basic to the judgment of moral character.

The critic should be concerned with whether or not the speaker was interested in accomplishing the greatest possible total good and his success towards that end. Obviously, this is a difficult task, since man operates in a complex world with most situations containing innumerable interwoven factors.[36] Aristotle went so far as to declare it the orator's duty to make use of his superior knowledge to lead his listeners in the "proper" direction.[37] That view would hardly be widely acclaimed today, but the task of the present-day rhetorical critic does clearly include a judgment as to whether the speaker's philosophy and goals are in accord with his listeners' best interests.

Intelligence is also a factor involved in "goodness." In society today:

> we cannot even be "good" unless we are first intelligent. . . . To choose the right in any sense in which such a choice has moral significance, we must first know the right.[38]

"Right choice depends quite as much on knowing what one ought to do as on the will to do it."[39] Reference can be made to Aristotle again for further support of this principle.[40]

In judging any of the factors listed above, the rhetorical critic has not only the right but the responsibility of evaluating the words and actions of the orator on occasions other than the one in question. The speaker's attitudes either before or after the speech may be of considerable assistance in judging his sincerity, his intelligence, his character as distinguished from reputation, and/or his desire to promote his listeners' best interests.

The fact has frequently been emphasized that eloquence flourishes only in democratic surroundings.[41] A listing of great orators who have been known particularly for democratic ideals would be so lengthy as to be meaningless. Yet, it is significant that the Huey Longs and Bilbos have not been remembered as great speakers, in spite of immediate successes. Their failure to meet the

[32] "A truthful person is free from duplicity or fraud; he is characterized by sincerity, genuineness, and straightforwardness in conduct, thought, and speech." Harold H. Titus, *Ethics For Today* (1947), p. 280.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

[34] Nicolai Hartmann, *Ethics*, Translated by Stanton Coit (1932), II, 283.

[35] Titus, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

[36] "The problem is not *which* values should be sought and which categorically excluded, but how the greatest total value may be secured. The real task is that of wisely balancing many goods, so as to secure the most valuable combination." Clifford L. Barrett, *Ethics, An Introduction To The Philosophy of Moral Values* (1933), p. 2.

[37] *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, Translated by J. E. C. Welldon (1886), pp. 6-8.

[38] Titus, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

[39] Burnett H. Streeter, *Moral Adventure* (1935), p. 27.

[40] Welldon, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-14.

[41] For example, see: Blair, *op. cit.*, pp. 319-36 and Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

"good man" standards and their disdain for democratic principles were certainly involved in these failures. Americans seem to have made support of democratic principles an essential part of their "good man." A review of the contents of the recent *History and Criticism of American Public Address*[42] reveals that every orator of sufficient prominence to be considered in the area of Statecraft has been a champion of democracy and the will of the people. Or, to state it in another way, rhetorical critics and historians have seemed to decree that prominence be accorded to those who have championed democracy.

The criteria for determing "goodness" which have been discussed above are intended only as suggestions of the type of evaluations which must be made. Rhetoricians seem to have been influenced in their judgments of speakers' philosophies by such concepts as the following: conduct in dealing with others —such as sincerity, kindness, consideration, and justice; personal habits—such as temperance and virtue; and, mental and personality traits—such as accurate judgment, calmness, and courage. Although this list may seem too vague and highly generalized to be even suggestive of what the rhetorician should evaluate, the author agrees with those scholars in the field of ethics who contend that it is impossible to make a definitive list of virtues.[43] In all cases, the rhetorician must remember that valid judgments are rendered not by examining specific items in isolation but by an appreciation of all the interlocking factors involved in any situation. This, of course, coincides with the principles of rhetorical criticism which also emphasize the total picture.[44]

The rhetorical critic, in the opinion of the author of this paper, should realize that our Western civilization and our Christian culture of today utilize principles to set apart the "good man" which could not be indiscriminately applied to all speakers of all ages. Perhaps critics today distinguish the "good man" by his respect for the "sacred" personality of others, his championship of the rights of the many against the special interests of the few, his program to ameliorate the lot of the less fortunate, or his belief in such human rights as Roosevelt's "four freedoms." This paper, however, has not attempted to prescribe dogmatically the specific qualities which should be used to determine the "good man." Rather, the attempt has been to show: first, that the task of the rhetorical critic does include a determination of the moral character of the speaker; and second, that the standards of the rhetorical critic in judging moral character depend upon detailed analysis and synthesis of certain factors of the type suggested here. The rhetorician knows that many of his judgments of the orator's "goodness" will be subjective. But the measure of the critic's competence will depend, in part, upon how well he can meet the challenge of this very difficult task.

Shall we agree with Quintilian's "good

[42] William Norwood Brigance, *A History and Criticism of American Public Address* (1943), 2 Vols.

[43] "In customary morality it is possible to draw up a list or catalogue of vices and virtues. . . . [But] in reflective morality, a list of virtues has a much more tentative status. Honesty, patriotism, modesty, toleration, bravery, kindness, etc., cannot be given a fixed meaning, because each expresses an interest in objects and institutions which are changing." John Dewey and James H. Tufts, *Ethics* (1932), pp. 280, 281.

[44] "The critic of speeches must recognize the patent fact that communication takes place in a social sphere—that it relates men to their environment; he must acknowledge as a hypothesis the possibility that the communicative intent of a speaker may have consequential influence upon the behavior of listeners." A Craig Baird and Lester Thonssen, *The Nature of Rhetorical Criticism* (State University of Iowa, Unpublished Manuscript), pp. 15-16.

man" requirements for the "good orator"? Rhetorical critics through the centuries have found it necessary that they determine and approve the moral character of the "good man" speaking. Today, which of our speakers will we consider great orators, statesmen, leaders toward right goals for humanity? Like Quintilian, we cannot accept the liar, the cheat, the blackmailer, the fraud. We require that high moral standards be met.

THREE ALLIED ARTS

JOHN T. FLANAGAN

A READER on going to a library in search of a volume of public addresses is often puzzled to discover that the book he desires is shelved not with poetry, essays, fiction—kindred products of the human brain—but separately under a classification of its own, as if oratory were something unique and special. Likewise, the college student wishing to study public speaking finds that his course is listed not under English or Literature but within a separate department, a policy which may be wise administratively but which often only adds to the dubious segregation of intellectual disciplines. This passion to specialize has resulted in the erection of mental barriers almost as tangible and certainly as disastrous as those tariff barriers which keep beef out of one country and coal out of another. Yet it was not so long ago that Matthew Arnold defined literature as including all things written, and the world has had more than one Thomas Babington Macaulay whose vocation was history, whose parliamentary career made him a skillful public speaker, and whose achievement was literature.

It is true that public address differs from both history and literature in basic ways. It alone depends to a large extent on auditory and visual effect. Gesture, appearance, enunciation, speech rhythm, tone color are all important to the speaker. Deprived of these concrete appeals, even the most eloquent address tends to lose something of its impact when reduced to the printed page. Moreover, the impassioned rhetoric of a Webster and the scene painting of a Burke often seem tinsel and fustian when stripped from the mouth of the speaker. A speech addressed to the ear is quite a different thing from a piece of expository prose designed to persuade or influence a reader in the calm of his study, and it is only the unusually gifted orator who can command logic and analysis as easily as he can display metaphor and hyperbole.

Yet there is no need to argue that public address is either unhistorical or unliterary. If orations have been somewhat less immediately effective than battles in influencing the tide of human progress, they have served magnificently to rally a populace or to vitalize a cause. One remembers Patrick Henry appearing before the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Shakespearian Henry V inciting his men to action before the gates of Harfleur, Daniel Webster placing property rights above human rights at the time of the Compromise of 1850 and striving to convince New England that he was clairvoyant, Winston Churchill repelling a German invasion with words when rifles were scarce and the steel to make tanks and planes was still unmined. Was it only accidental that the speeches uttered at these critical times transcended ordinary rhetoric, or that the words of the speakers will be remembered long after the occasion which called them forth is forgotten? The classics of public address have not been produced during the doldrums of mundane life; they have been hammered out at tense and critical times. These

JOHN T. FLANAGAN *is Associate Professor of English at the University of Illinois. He has contributed to various historical and literary journals, and is now engaged upon a History of Middlewestern Literature.*

speeches were great literature on historic occasions; they remain great literature after the historic occasions have faded; they would have been great literature if they had never been delivered at all, if they had been made public only via the printed page. Indeed they exemplify the essential unity of the three arts—history, literature, and public address: glowing words publicly proclaimed at a crisis in human destiny.

It is increasingly apparent today that a synthesis of the arts is required before the understanding of any one art is complete. Numerous studies of the great English poets, of Keats or Byron or Coleridge, have taken their roots as much in psychology as in literary history. Charles Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution has gone a long way to enforce revised judgments of the Federalist men of property who built a new American government. The meaning of modern poetry has been illuminated (and sometimes muddied!) by semantics. Men like Whistler, Sidney Lanier, James Joyce, Frank Lloyd Wright, Thomas Hart Benton, Marsden Hartley, have been individually at home in painting and writing, in music and poetry, in fiction and architecture, in criticism and drawing, and have permitted the principles and methods of one art to cross-fertilize another. Merle Curti's Pulitzer prize-winning history of American thought is a kind of Hegelian syncretism of intellectual America.

It is equally apparent that artistic expression often owes less to special gifts than to long training, experience, analysis, and deliberately calculated effect. When Poe published his essay on "The Philosophy of Composition" a century ago, it may be assumed that not every reader acquiesced in his account of how "The Raven" was composed; in his insistence on tonal effect, the use of a refrain, the choice of a metre, the selection of a creature who could utter only one phrase and "nothing more," Poe squeezed out all spontaneity. But even if we today are inclined to admit that art requires more than the divine afflatus, we often forget the extent of the artifice, the preparation, and the contribution of other creative forms.

In a recent article in these pages Davis Edwards has demonstrated the tremendous effect upon the poetic technique of Vachel Lindsay of the lecture-readings of S. H. Clark of the University of Chicago.[1] Many a listener to Lindsay must have been impressed as much by the histrionism, the vocal flourishes, the contrived tonal effects of the poet as he was by the verse itself. As Lindsay postured and gesticulated in his delivery of "The Congo," perhaps for the five-thousandth time, his audience could not have helped being conscious of the fact that many of Lindsay's effects were not implicit in the poetry at all but were superimposed because of the poet's belief in the need for vocal and almost instrumental accompaniment which the words alone were inadequate to convey. Wisely or unwisely, Lindsay combined poetry and public address, literature and speech. In his self-chosen role of the bard he went up and down the land bringing poetry to the people, bringing poetry home to those who were unwilling or unable to read. As a consequence, no reader of Lindsay's verse will ever be able to do him justice without some recognition of the oratorical flourishes which he combined with his poetry.

A similar example might be adduced from the experience of Abraham Lincoln. To many readers today Lincoln is the great exemplar of the untutored,

[1] Davis Edwards, "The Real Source of Vachel Lindsay's Poetic Technique," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXXIII (1947), 182-95.

unschooled, spontaneous artist who achieved his mastery of the English tongue through a combination of native genius and God-given inspiration. But even Lincoln depended more upon calculation and experience than upon chance. A stimulating paper by Roy P. Basler on Lincoln's development as a writer proves indubitably that such masterpieces as the Gettysburg Address, the Second Inaugural, even the famous letter to Mrs. Bixby, did not originate by accident.[2] Lincoln had studied the speech rhythms of the Bible, the fables of Aesop, the blunt and homely language of Bunyan. From such sources he learned something of the art of story telling and considerably more about literary and rhetorical effect. As Basler observed, even Lincoln's crudest and most obvious "rhetorical blandishments in his early speeches exemplify his deliberate seeking for effect."[3] Subsequently Lincoln, despite his apparent dedication to simplicity and casualness, employed all the devices of the most wily orator. No reader of the celebrated utterances of the presidential period will fail to note Lincoln's use of parallel structure, of antithesis, of balanced sentences. Lincoln's fondness for homely stories was both natural and useful to him, for a simple anecdote could often be more telling than paragraphs of rhetoric. His metaphors were infrequent but highly effective and of an unusual kind, like the assertion that the Union was a divided house. And although Lincoln did not choose to write in verse, he utilized literary methods such as alliteration, assonance, and repetition of key words which are commonly considered the property of the poet.[4] In other words Lincoln, supposedly the homespun orator whose appeal to his audiences came directly from forthright honesty and genuine emotion, carefully studied rhetorical effect and out of his vast experience in stump speaking drew the technique which produced the matchless orations of later years.

Previous paragraphs have emphasized the need for considering a public address as something more than a collection of words expressed vocally. To evaluate it intelligently one must understand its structure, but one must also know its implications, the cause which motivated it, the time of its delivery. If, as Emerson declared, "language is fossil poetry," then a significant address becomes a kind of archive revealing to the initiated a wealth of information about the cultural climate of the period.

The modern reader of the most famous of all the Phi Beta Kappa orations, Emerson's delineation of the American scholar delivered at Harvard in 1837, can hardly be expected to experience the thrill of reception which made the event unforgettable to all who heard the speaker. Today Emerson's definition of the scholar as Man Thinking, his plea for the scholar to act independently of the past, his scant respect for the pundits who lived before him, hardly seem innovations. Yet to understand the speech completely, to realize why Oliver Wendell Holmes termed it an intellectual declaration of independence,[5] one must know the ground out of which it grew.

Emerson himself was in some ways the product of an age of intellectual sterility. With the Revolution won and the battle over the acceptance of the Constitution terminated, American in-

[2] Roy P. Basler, "Lincoln's Development As A Writer," *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings* (Cleveland and New York, 1946), pp. 1-49.

[3] Basler, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[4] Basler, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

[5] Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1895), p. 115.

tellectual life began to sag. Ideas like books were largely imported, and native productions were both mediocre and imitative. Agitation for a national literature, anticipated by Channing and Noah Webster, was slow to develop and for years achieved only a sporadic importance. In the interim puerile Miltons and mimetic Addisons filled the pages of periodicals or produced annuals for the Christmas trade. It was such vacuous work that stimulated Emerson's later declaration that for some thirty years Massachusetts had not spawned a book, a speech, a conversation, or a thought;[6] and it was his recognition of American stagnation that gave vitality to his Phi Beta Kappa oration.

Today the speech obviously lives by its own merits and presents no difficulties. But the full impact of that address which closed the doors of official Harvard to the speaker for the subsequent thirty years is apparent only when Emerson's words are considered in the somewhat opaque light of the period.

Almost half a century later Wendell Phillips delivered another Harvard Phi Beta Kappa address which developed the familiar Emerson thesis of the scholar's duties and position.[7] But where Emerson had emphasized intellectual leadership Phillips, fresh from the abolitionist struggle, asserted that the scholar had a mandate to assume public responsibilities. No longer was the scholar's place in his study acting as an intelligent and objective observer, a role Emerson himself had consciously assumed, but rather in the forum or the legislative assembly. Phillips asserted that it was the duty of college-trained men to lead in the discussion of social questions, for "it is not the masses who have most disgraced our political annals."[8] Reiterating Emerson's doctrine of self-trust, he also exemplified Whitman's notion of a democracy which began and ended with the proletariat: "Trust the people —the wise and the ignorant, the good and the bad—with the gravest questions, and in the end you educate the race."[9]

Phillips's address, admittedly less cogent, less notable, than Emerson's would have been inconceivable without the earlier Harvard oration. The conception of the American scholar, although modified and in a sense publicized, is basically Emerson's conception. If Emerson, as Whitman later acknowledged, brought the simmering poet to a boil, so did he stimulate and impel Wendell Phillips, the firebrand of the abolitionists. It is impossible today to read Phillips's antislavery addresses without some notion of the animosities and recriminations of the period in which they were uttered; it is likewise impossible to read his oration on the scholar in a republic without an understanding of the earlier and more famous delineation of the same protagonist.

Further illustration from a different field, namely that of political speaking, may seem to be merely a belaboring of the obvious, yet one or two allusions are perhaps admissible. Robert Ingersoll was probably as influential and as notable as any orator of his time, and although like Thomas Paine his reputation for religious agnosticism has distorted his real position in American thought, he was revered for many years as a public figure of dignity, virtue, and eloquence. Ingersoll's set pieces of declamation, like the oration on the grave of Napoleon, were sincere and impassioned rhetoric, while his many lectures on

[6] *The Heart of Emerson's Journals*, ed. Bliss Perry (Boston and New York, 1926), p. 261.

[7] Wendell Phillips, "The Scholar in a Republic," in *Representative Phi Beta Kappa Orations*, ed. Clark S. Northup (New York, 1930).

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 201.

questions of theology or religion were founded on cool logic, sharp analysis, an informed scepticism, and a direct and persuasive appeal to the common sense of the audience. But when Ingersoll turned to partisan politics and took the stump in favor of the tariff, the cause of the Negro, and sound money, the mental qualities which distinguished his other addresses seemed temporarily absent and he became guilty of exaggeration, prejudice, intolerance, and inaccuracy. And always, in the words of recent students of Ingersoll, "he waved the bloody shirt."[10]

Thus the reader of Ingersoll today should come to his subject with broad training in the period in which Ingersoll once seemed so radiant. He must be prepared to see in his subject lingering traces of the florid language and conscious turgidity which delighted audiences accustomed to Webster and Calhoun. He must also be ready to evaluate Ingersoll's ability in an age of increasing scepticism, to observe the rejection of traditional authority and the mental precision revealed in such a lecture as "Some Mistakes of Moses." Even more important, he must be experienced enough in political oratory to perceive that Ingersoll's championing of certain men and causes (as in his canonizing of James G. Blaine as the Plumed Knight) was due to such unintellectual motives as personal feeling and party loyalty.

To an Emerson, political parties were ordinarily parties of circumstance, not of principle, and law for men was superior to law for things. To an Ingersoll, expediency and party regularity were omnipotent. The student of public address must be prepared for both attitudes. If knowledge of speech structure will shed light on the verbal patterns involved, so knowledge of the historical period is indispensable for an understanding of the motives actuating the words.

Probably no speech of the last half century has received the wide recognition accorded William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" oration which won him the Democratic nomination for the presidency at the Chicago convention of 1896. The address seized the nation by storm and launched the youthful candidate on the first of three unsuccessful campaigns. Yet it contrasts curiously with other famous speeches antecedent to it by two or three decades. Save for its famous final figure it does not glitter with metaphors; it is on the whole sober and restrained rather than vehement. The orotund periods of antebellum oratory did not suit Bryan's day, and in his most telling passages he chose homely and simple diction. As Jonathan P. Dolliver once pointed out, Bryan did not convert anyone to his own views but he converted those who held those views to him. Indeed, "his whole art consisted in summarizing the prejudices and convictions of the convention audibly, so that they could be heard, and coherently, so that they could be understood."[11]

To H. L. Mencken this talent of Bryan's to discuss the interests of the people in the language of the marketplace was something less than a virtue. Mencken asserted that Bryan was born with a roaring voice which had the trick of inflaming half-wits and that his ultimate motive in life was hatred for the city men who had long derided him.[12] Yet Mencken failed to admit

[10] Wayland Maxfield Parrish and Alfred Dwight Huston, "Robert G. Ingersoll," in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, ed. William Norwood Brigance (New York and London, 1943), I, 375.

[11] Jonathan P. Dolliver, Introduction, *Modern Eloquence* (New York, 1923), X, xxi.

[12] H. L. Mencken, *Prejudices, Fifth Series* (New York, 1926), pp. 68-9.

Bryan's power over mixed audiences, which occasionally included intelligent men among the yokels and certainly a large number of prairie radicals. Nor was he impressed by Bryan's unusual articulation and by the extraordinary concreteness of his style. Like Lincoln, Bryan worked hard to perfect his delivery and was perfectly conscious of artifice and tactics in performance.[13]

Speakers like Emerson, Phillips, Ingersoll, and Bryan differed widely in their intellectual heritage, training, ideology, erudition, and motivation. Probably the roster of American orators could reveal no four names more disparate than these, for almost their only common denominator is that each delivered at least one address which has become part of the American tradition. The student of expression will find enormous divergences in the utterances of these men, each revealing his own particular method of securing a desired effect. And the student of American thought will discover in them highly significant revelations of an ethos and a period.

In one sense all these men were reformers. Emerson pleaded for self-reliance and the perfectibility of man, Phillips campaigned more specifically against slavery and advocated the improvement of government by the entrance of scholars into the political arena, Ingersoll attacked what he deemed the errors of an arrogant church, Bryan represented the protests of agrarian democracy against eastern capitalism. There was nothing of the demagogue in the first, but more than a slight suspicion of opportunism in the other three. Emerson alone cared nothing for converts; the rest tried by might and main to persuade and convince. Emerson, for six years of his life a professional clergyman and for most of his life a pulpit orator, seldom used logical demonstration and resorted more than anything else to affirmation. The others utilized analysis wherever possible, direct appeal to the reasoning faculties of their audiences, occasional rhetorical flourishes.

In purely literary qualities Emerson transcends the rest. In actual effect upon an audience which, if it did not come to scoff and remain to pray, at least appeared in a sceptical and even antagonistic mood, Ingersoll probably achieved the most. Neither Phillips nor Bryan could match his combination of personality, suavity, command of his medium, scene-painting ability, or calculatingly designed manipulation.

An address such as "The American Scholar" ceases to be merely the words of the speaker on a given occasion but becomes an important segment of the national literature. Assuming such salience it grows tri-dimensional to future generations and, like a Shakespearian play, has multiple levels of meaning. The student of literature cannot afford to neglect its value as a spoken unit; the historian cannot overlook its aesthetic impact; the specialist in public address cannot ignore either its literary qualities or its importance as a revelation of the ideas and tastes of its time.

One is driven to repeat the initial dictum. However the study of public utterance is classified, whatever bypaths its partisans choose, it must *ipso facto* include not only an analysis of speaking itself but a study of the climate which produces it and the aesthetic qualities which it possesses. In this way history, literature, and public address coalesce, a triad which grows sturdier when the claims of each member are recognized.

[13] Myron G. Phillips, "William Jennings Bryan," in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*," II, 913-917.

SPEECH AND LEADERSHIP IN BUSINESS

S. C. ALLYN

IF we ask, "What is it worth to a young man to be able to speak well?" we might seek the answer by analyzing some of the situations in which a man starting a business career is likely to find himself.

The lifeline of any business is its channels of communication, and there are only two principal methods of conveying information from one person to another or from one group to another. One is the written word, the other the spoken word. There is no point in trying to evaluate their relative importance; both play a vital part in the successful operation of any business, for there can be no success where there is no understanding, and there can be no understanding where there is not a free exchange of ideas.

Having seen the truth of this statement demonstrated so many times that, to me, it is axiomatic, I often wonder why more attention is not devoted by individuals and by educational institutions to the development of ability in public speaking. Men who are preparing for the practice of law or for entry into the ministry recognize that the ability to speak well is the very basis of their profession and overlook no opportunity to develop themselves in this direction. Yet, too often, the man who expects ultimately to be a business executive, an accountant, an engineer, a member of supervision in a factory, a salesman, or a success in some other field, gives public speaking only a secondary consideration, if, indeed, he considers it at all. As a result, we have the all too frequent picture of a man who is brilliantly equipped from the standpoint of technical training and knowledge in his particular field, but who labors under the handicap of an inability to express his ideas and his convictions clearly to others. He may be successful in spite of that handicap, but he would be unquestionably more successful without it.

S. C. ALLYN *is President of the National Cash Register Company and is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin.*

I

Ability to speak well no longer is a professional art to be mastered only by lawyers, preachers, teachers, and entertainers. The man preparing for leadership in business needs this ability too, because leadership expresses itself primarily through speech.

The business executive uses speech to get action, to direct that action, and to report on that action. Good speech reflects sound thinking and the forward-looking business man recognizes it as necessary to the intelligent conduct of his business, as well as to his personal advancement in the business world.

The occasions on which he may be called to speak are numerous. They may include a gathering of employees, a conference with associates, a meeting of the board of directors, or a public dinner or convention. To the man who has set his sights on advancement, these are opportunities not to be ignored, and he would not dodge them even if he could.

Because our own business offers a source of practical examples, let us look at its different branches from the viewpoint of the calls made upon members of our organization to utilize their abili-

ties to speak. Ours is a manufacturing business with a world-wide distribution of its products. Its three principal divisions are broadly classified as sales, manufacturing, and general management.

We have in our field organization approximately 2,000 salesmen. A large percentage of these men are college graduates, and all have been highly trained technically in the field of business systems. In their daily work they contact every type of business man, from individual owners of retail stores to the management and often the boards of directors of banks, department stores, and other large businesses. Their job primarily is one of explanation and education. They know the advantages of the suggested system and the weaknesses of the old system, but, until they convey that picture to the management of the business they are contacting, no action is likely to result. So the ability to express themselves well becomes essential to them because they need that ability in their everyday work. It is by no means an overstatement to say that no man can expect to achieve maximum success in our selling organization without the ability to speak well in public. And I think the same can be said of salesmen of any other company.

There are secondary opportunities, as well, for a selling man to put to good use this ability. In our branch operations, meetings are held every week and sometimes oftener in order that men may be kept acquainted with current problems and developments, and so they may exchange ideas. If a man cannot speak well from the platform, he obviously can take little part in these meetings and his contribution will be negligible.

At least once a year we have a series of meetings for which men are brought from the field to the factory. These are educational meetings, and the programs are presented in large measure by field representatives. As an example, this past summer all of our branch managers came to Dayton for one meeting, and all of our accounting machine managers and senior salesmen for another. These meetings lasted a week. More than 200 men attended the first gathering and 350 the second. About 30 field men made presentations from the platform at each meeting. Without exception, these presentations were well made and were a credit to those who participated.

II

While no records have ever been kept on the point, I know that in the history of our business, many a man has drawn attention to himself by a good job done on the platform. I might illustrate this with one example that we can follow through the years.

A good many years ago a young man, who was then in charge of a small NCR branch in Kansas, was attending a sales convention. He was called upon, with a number of other men from the field, to state what the convention had meant to him. He gave a rather unusual talk and among other points made a statement to this effect:

> I think the National Cash Register Company is an exceptional business, because I know of no other business where so many people would be working *for me*. Every person in this factory —from Mr. Patterson, the president, on down— is working for me. If I were in business for myself, I would have to provide my own premises, buy my own stock of merchandise, prepare my own advertising, carry my own accounts receivable, and give constant thought to the future development of my product. Here, all of this is done for me and the only investment I must make is my time and effort. That is why I say that Mr. Patterson and the entire factory organization are working for me.

There was, of course, much more to the talk than these few highlights, but they serve to convey the idea.

Mr. John H. Patterson, founder of the business, who always was on the lookout for ability, commented favorably on what the young man had said. At the close of the meeting the men went back to their territories. Several weeks later an appointment in the Sales Division at the factory was under consideration. Mr. Patterson remarked, "Where is that young man who made such a good talk at the convention? I like the way he thinks and the way he expresses himself."

That man was brought to Dayton. He has held many important positions in the business during the intervening years, and is, today, our Vice-President in charge of Sales.

Of course, he did not get his present job, nor is he holding it, solely because of his ability as a speaker. But I can say, without any qualification, that he certainly never would have been placed in that position if he had not been able to speak well.

Perhaps this is enough evidence to indicate the importance of speaking ability to anyone entering the sales field. Now let us turn to the factory. I cannot think of a department head, a factory supervisor or a foreman who is not called upon from time to time to speak in public, some with greater frequency than others, but all at some time or another. We have frequent meetings of our factory organization. They range from weekly meetings of foremen and supervisors to less frequent meetings involving many others. At all of them men are called upon to speak. Our factory organization takes a very active part in community affairs and we encourage our branch organizations throughout the country to do the same. This, in itself, creates many situations where men are called upon to speak in public.

If we turn to other fields we find speaking ability just as plainly needed. The medical man participates in conventions of his profession; the retailer, within his own organization and in trade groups, finds constant need for expression; the accountant, the executive, the engineer, all find the need as they rise to positions of prominence in their respective fields. And, of course, with the lawyer, the minister, the teacher, public speaking ability is vital to the practice of their professions.

III

We might consider briefly the question of how a man can qualify himself to speak well in public. I suppose there are some men who are born with certain talents in this direction, but their number is relatively small. For the great majority of us, ability on the platform will come only through training and practice.

The average man should not expect to be able to step to a platform and make a good talk without training, any more than he would expect to be able to solve a business or technical problem in which he was untrained. He must build up to this job just as he would to any other.

For that reason I do not hesitate to make two definite recommendations to any young man who expects to succeed in the business world or in any other field. First, see that training in speech has a place in your curriculum, regardless of what specific course you may be taking. Second, associate yourself with some organization that will provide the opportunity to practice what you have learned. It may be a social organization, a debating society, a dramatic group, or any one of many others. Participation in such activities will pay tremendous dividends in improvement of speaking ability.

In our own business and in many others, development in speaking is considered so important that facilities are provided within the organization for continuous training along this line.

IV

I know that, in the minds of many men, there is great hesitancy to appear on the platform. Frankly, I have greater hopes for the ultimate speaking proficiency of such men than I do of those who casually and nonchalantly approach the platform with little preparation, fill in the allotted time with so many words, and consider the job done. There is no substitute for preparation, although, unfortunately, far too many speeches are given without adequate preparation. The trained speaker is able to speak well in an impromptu manner on subjects he knows thoroughly, but on a major presentation adequate preparation is the only real key to success, regardless of how much speaking experience a man may have had. After all, the process of speaking is merely a means of conveying a message. The strength of the message, itself, depends entirely upon the amount of preparation that went into it.

Not long ago I was talking with a man who has achieved a great reputation as a spontaneous speaker. No matter where he goes—class reunion, social gathering, or convention—he can rise to his feet and make a polished talk that aptly fits the occasion. I asked him, "How do you do it?"

"I have prepared or thought out hundreds of speeches that I never delivered," he replied. "For years I have made it a rule to prepare myself if I am suddenly called on to say something, no matter if the gathering is ten people or a thousand. Sometimes the lightning strikes; sometimes it does not. But when it does strike, I am ready."

So, too, the man who wants to get ahead in any field, must always be ready.

We are living in a day when the ability to communicate with each other and to understand each other is of greater importance than ever before. Tremendous strides have been made technologically in the development of means of communication between distant points. But the basis of all communication still remains the written or the spoken word, and the man who has learned to use both effectively has taken an important step on the road to success.

THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

WILLIAM A. BEHL

EVER since the United Nations was organized, the Security Council has held the spotlight. It is natural that this body of the world organization should be the focal point of observation and criticism because the Security Council is the heart of the United Nations. The primary function of the Security Council is the "maintenance of international peace and security."[1] Chapters five to eight inclusive of the United Nations Charter give it not only complete power of investigation and recommendation, but also the power to carry into action any of its recommendations. This is a grave responsibility.

My object is to explain briefly the framework of the Security Council and to set forth some of the more important values and limitations inherent in its present structure. Since the chief method of the Council is open and frank discussion and debate of problems concerning international security, it should be of interest to the student of public speaking to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the Security Council as an international deliberative body.

I

The Council is composed of eleven members: five of them permanent members, and six elected by the General Assembly for terms of two years. The five permanent members are Russia, The United Kingdom, China, France, and the United States. The non-permanent members at the present time are Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, Poland, and Syria. Non-permanent members are not eligible to succeed themselves on the Council.

Matters concerning the security of the world may be brought to the Council in several ways: by a member of the Security Council, by the Secretary-General, by any member state of the United Nations, by the General Assembly, or by a state that is not a member of the United Nations. Any nation, not a member of the United Nations, must agree to abide by the decision of the Council before the Council will consider its problem.

Generally speaking, the discussion of problems by the Security Council is not hampered by complicated rules of procedure. The adoption of the agenda and the method of voting, however, do present certain complications. These complications will be discussed later. The set rules of procedure adopted by the Security Council deal largely with the selection of the chairman or the President of the Council, the preparation of the agenda, and the time of meetings.[2] The chairmanship of the Council rotates alphabetically by country, each representative serving for one month. The agenda is usually prepared by the President of the Council in cooperation with the assistant Secretary-General. Usually any matter to appear on the agenda must be presented to the President or the Secretary-General three days in advance of the meeting of the Security Council. When the Council convenes, the first matter of business is to adopt the agenda

WILLIAM A. BEHL *is Assistant Professor of Speech at Brooklyn College and is a member of the Association's Committee on Contemporary Public Address.*

[1] *United Nations Charter*, Chapter V, Article 24, paragraph 1.

[2] *Security Council, Provisional Rules of Procedure*, 27 June 1946, Lake Success, New York.

presented to it. It is at this point that certain complications arise which will be discussed later. Usually several representatives have requested permission to speak to resolutions on the agenda. The chairman recognizes these requests in the order they were presented. If no prior requests have been made, the chairman recognizes speakers as accurately as possible. The chairman may speak to a resolution as the representative of his country but not as chairman of the Council.

Representatives from countries not members of the Security Council or, in some cases, not members of the United Nations, are permitted to speak to resolutions if the nation making the request is closely concerned with the substance of the resolution. Such was the case when representatives from Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia appeared at the Council table during the Greek-Albanian border dispute. Naturally, only the members of the Security Council are permitted to vote.

II

The disposition of a resolution before the Council may take various turns. Normally, the disposition is accomplished by voting to approve or disapprove the resolution under discussion. However, after considerable discussion of a specific resolution, it may be the opinion of the Council that more evidence is needed to reach a final decision. In such a case some member may move that a committee be formed to investigate and submit evidence as well as conclusions concerning the main resolution. After many days of discussion, this was the final decision taken on the Greek border dispute. Again, the Council may wish to postpone further discussion and the voting until a specific date. Such a motion concluded the first discussion of the resolution that "The Security Council having received and examined the Annexes to the proposed Peace Treaty with Italy relating to the creation and government of the Free Territory of Trieste, hereby records its approval of the said Annexes, . . ."[3] Other methods do not differ materially from the usual parliamentary methods of disposing of motions.

The values and limitations of the Security Council as a deliberative body are perhaps of more interest to students of debate and discussion. Several advantages may be found in the structure of the Security Council. One of the more desirable qualities of the Council is that it is composed of only eleven members. It is generally agreed that a small body of eight to twelve members operates more efficiently than a larger or smaller group when discussing problems that require a specific decision or course of action.[4]

A second advantage is that once a problem is admitted to the agenda, discussion and debate are not hampered by complicated rules of procedure. Problems are discussed rather freely and openly. Each representative has ample opportunity to present his arguments and evidence. The small number on the Council is a decided advantage in giving every representative sufficient time to present his point of view in detail. It is obvious from the study of official records of Security Council proceedings that representatives take advantage of the free and open discussion that prevails in the Council. This study, however, is a subject of a separate report. It is doubtful that unrestricted discussion has hampered achievements in the Security Council.

[3] *Security Council, Official Records,* Second Year, No. 1, 89th meeting, 7 February, 1947, p. 2.

[4] J. H. McBurney and K. G. Hance, *The Principles and Methods of Discussion* (New York, 1939), p. 289.

Another part of the structure of the Council that helps to make it an effective deliberative body is the provision that permits the Council to send a special commission to the specific location where the breach, apparent or real, to international security is occurring.[5] This provision is highly significant because, in some cases, it is essential to get first-hand information and evidence if justice is to be done. Article twenty-nine was invoked in the Grecian border dispute when the Security Council sent a special commission to investigate the conflict between Greece and Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. Such a subcommittee has the powers of investigation and recommendation. The Security Council may or may not concur with the recommendations of the special commission. If several incidents are occurring at the same time, the Council has the power to send special commissions to the scene of each incident.

There are also two permanent commissions established to assist the Security Council in maintaining peace and security in the world: the Military Staff Commission and the Atomic Energy Commission. The Military Staff Commission was established to "advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament."[6] The Atomic Energy Commission was created because it was believed that the control of atomic energy was a special military problem. Any action taken by either of these commissions is subject to the approval of the Security Council.

[5] *United Nations Charter*, Chapter V, Article 29.
[6] *Ibid.*, Chapter VII, Article 47.

Another distinct advantage of the Security Council is that an official representative of each member of the Council is on call at all times at the seat of the United Nations.[7] If an incident is reported that needs immediate attention, the Council can go to work without delay. The importance of this Article was demonstrated when the Indonesian-Dutch incident was reported to the Council. The Council went into session immediately and passed a resolution requesting the parties to cease hostilities until a more detailed investigation could be made. Both parties agreed to the request of the Council.

III

In a general way, the Security Council is guided by special articles in the United Nations Charter concerning the method of settlement of any disputes that are likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Article thirty-three of the Charter suggests that the Security Council may request parties to a dispute to "seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."[8] An important part of this Article is that regional agencies may settle disputes within their jurisdiction. That is, if the United States and Mexico should encounter border difficulties which they cannot settle between them, they may submit their case to the Pan-American Union for settlement instead of presenting the case to the Security Council. In this case the Security Council may suggest ways and means of settling the dispute, taking into account any measures that the disputants have already adopted.

[7] *Ibid.*, Chapter V, Article 28.
[8] *Ibid.*, Chapter VI, Article 33.

In the event a settlement cannot be reached under article thirty-three, the Council then takes complete charge of the dispute and, after complete investigation, makes specific recommendations for pacific settlement of the dispute.[9] Such recommendations may include "complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication and severance of diplomatic relations."[10] The severance of diplomatic relations was recommended in the case of the Franco regime in Spain.

Should none of the pacific recommendations or the economic and political sanctions be sufficient to prevent a dispute from endangering the security and peace of the world, the Council must recommend the use of force. It is at this point that the Military Commission must aid and advise the Security Council as well as plan the overall use of the International Police Force provided for in the United Nations Charter.[11]

A final distinct merit of the structural organization of the Security Council is that "The members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council."[12] The assurance that their decisions will not be cast aside has inspired the Security Council to discharge its duties with sincerity, thoroughness, and fairness.

IV

One of the disadvantages of the Security Council as a deliberative body is that considerable time is lost during discussion by waiting for translations. The official languages used in the oral discussion are French and English. If, for example, Mr. Gromyko speaks in Russian, his message must be translated into French and English. Of course, if French or English are used only one translation is necessary. A visitor to the sessions observes considerable talking, absence from the group, and even napping during long translations. This undesirable aspect of the Council's discussion is accentuated by the use of simultaneous translations in several languages. That is, if the Chinese representative is speaking in Chinese, members of the Council and the Press may get a free translation of the message by the use of head phones and a push-button for the desired translation. In this way the Council members get a reasonably accurate report of what the representatives say at the time of utterance, which gives them more leisure time during the official translations into French and English. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to do away with the translations into French and English because many members understand only their own language and French or English.

A more serious restriction to free and uninterrupted discussion in the Council is that the representatives from the various countries are limited by instructions on specific issues from their governments. Whoever visits the Council in session with any regularity will discover that this restriction retards the progress of solution to problems. Not infrequently discussion on a problem is, for all practical purposes, stopped by one or more representatives saying that they cannot continue discussion or vote on a measure because they do not know the official position of their government on the matter. A study of the official records of the Security Council reveals the fact that virtually every representative has invoked this restriction; it has been used most frequently by members of the

[9] *Ibid.*, Chapter VI, Article 38.
[10] *Ibid.*, Chapter VII, Article 41.
[11] *Ibid.*, Chapter VIII, Articles 43 and 45.
[12] *Ibid.*, Chapter V, Article 25.

Big Five powers. Some countries are slow to give additional instructions to their Council representatives. We are led to wonder what the result would be if the Council was forced to consider an emergency incident.

But the most serious handicap to the solution of problems presented to the Council is the method of voting. Matters brought before the Security Council are divided into procedural matters and substantive matters. Procedural matters include the adoption of the agenda, adoption of rules of procedure, and the like. On such matters seven of the eleven members must vote in the affirmative to pass a resolution. The number seven, rather than six—a bare majority, was adopted to prevent the smaller nations from controlling the vote on procedural matters. There are five major powers and six minor powers on the Council. The number of votes to pass a resolution on procedural matters is not the real handicap; it is the fact that representatives become confused as to what are substantive matters. This was certainly true concerning the discussion of the Statute of Trieste[13] and the discussion of the Greek-Albanian border dispute.[14]

The voting on substantive matters presents a more serious handicap than the voting on procedural matters. The voting on substantive matters, which includes all matters other than procedural, "shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including concurring votes of the permanent members. . . ."[15] In other words, the votes of USSR, China, United Kingdom, France, and the United States must be among the seven votes cast to carry a resolution dealing with a substantive matter. This procedure was included in the structure of the Security Council to insure that any action involving the peace and security of the world should have the support of the five major powers. The procedure is commonly referred to as the "veto." It is fairly clear that the adoption of this method of voting on other than procedural matters was to give protection to any of the major countries that might find itself in a minority position on some problem of world peace and security.

V

It is too early to make a final appraisal of the use of the "veto," but evidence to date indicates that it is a serious hindrance to the Security Council in settling problems of international importance. The leading example of the stupefying effect this procedure has on the Council is the attempted solution of the border dispute between Greece and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The Commission, representing the members of the Security Council, which was sent to the scene of the incidents found that the major portion of the blame should be put on Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, but the "veto" by Russia prevented the Council from taking any formal action.[16] The net result is, of course, for Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to continue their support of the Communist bands in and around the borders of

[13] *Security Council, Official Records,* Ninety-first meeting, No. 3, 10 January 1947, Lake Success, New York.

[14] *Ibid.,* Fifty-eighth and fifty-ninth meeting, Nos. 6 and 7, 30 August 1946 and 3 September 1946.

[15] *United Nations Charter,* Chapter V, Article 27.

[16] *Security Council, Official Records,* Fifty-eighth meeting, No. 6, 30 August 1946; Fifty-ninth meeting, No. 7, 3 September 1946; Sixtieth meeting, No. 8, 4 September 1946; Sixty-first, Sixty-second, Sixty-third meetings, No. 9, 5 and 6 September 1946; Sixty-fourth meeting, No. 10, 9 September 1946; Sixty-sixth meeting, No. 12, 11 September 1946; Sixty-eighth meeting, No. 14, 17 September 1946; Seventieth meeting, No. 16, 20 September 1946, Ninety-sixth meeting, No. 7, 28 January 1947, Lake Success, New York.

Greece; and for Greece to continue to resist these border incidents with aid from the United States and Great Britain. Without passing judgment concerning the guilt in this case, it is deplorable that a body set up to solve such situations cannot do anything about it because of the "veto." The complete ineffectiveness of the Council in this incident was reached when the whole matter was referred to the General Assembly for solution.

The use of the "veto" has hindered the settlement of other disputes brought before the Council, though they are of minor importance. Typical of these minor incidents was the Corfu Channel incident.[17] Forty-four British sailors lost their lives when a British ship struck a mine in the Corfu Channel. The majority of the Council members agreed that Albania was responsible for the incident and should be held accountable but a "veto" by Russia prevented any formal action.

[17] *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 3.

VI

There is little doubt that in many ways the Security Council is far superior to any other international body, past or present, as an agency for settling international disputes that are likely to endanger world peace and security. Some of its more important advantages are: 1. Its decisions are binding on all members of the United Nations, 2. it can send special commissions to the scene of incidents, 3. representatives are on constant call at the seat of the United Nations, 4. it is a small body, 5. discussions are relatively free and unrestricted. However, all these advantages and others too are nullified by the use of the "veto" by any one of the permanent members of the Security Council. The work of the Council, no matter how speedy, thorough, and just, is of little value if one of the Big Five votes in the negative on any substantive resolution.

THE 1947 CAMBRIDGE UNION TOUR

I. S. LLOYD and W. H. L. RICHMOND

AMERICA is a country which always leaves its visitors with a host of vivid impressions of colorful and amiable personalities and of a tempo of life which is exceeded in few countries. It was our privilege to be the guests of a not unrepresentative cross-section of the American people and to talk with them, and to them, on a variety of subjects formal and informal. Many impressions remain: the diversity of opinion on some subjects, the uniformity on others, the sincerity rather than the novelty of argument, the rather heavy collar and lead with which humor was chained in formal debate, a somewhat naive faith in the sheer numerical weight of argument rather than its intrinsic value, and, in strange contrast a refreshing ability to find, develop and stick to one really good point—the employment of verbal Panzer divisions to break through the weakest points in the enemy's line of defense—coupled with the ability to fully exploit the break through.

What is really of interest to American readers, however, is our opinion of the American system of debate, and to what extent we think that this contributes any noticeable uniformities to the end-product—the platform speaker and his technique. Several things struck us after our first few debates. We were interested in the first place in the physical arrangements, for these are far more important than is generally recognized. It is undoubtedly true that the shape of an assembly—particularly whether or not the parties oppose each other or sit in a circle from left to right—profoundly affects the character of the debate. The most noticeable features then were these. The principal speakers were invariably seated on a platform facing the audience, the rostrum usually being in front of the Chairman. This leads to two things. The first is a mental, as well as physical, separation between speakers and the audience; the second is that speakers only address their remarks very formally through the chair. They say "Mr. Chairman" at the beginning of the speech, and thereafter the poor man is completely ignored. This is in strong contrast to the Cambridge and Oxford Unions, and to Parliament where all remarks are addressed to the President or the Speaker, and it is a convention that the speech is not addressed to the house itself. Consequently the chairman is a mere formality and, after having introduced the speakers, he has no real function to perform during the course of the debate. So much for the physical environment.

The mental environment came as a great surprise. We did not encounter any system of formal interruption in any of our debates—interruption that is from the opposing speakers or from members of the audience when their ideas or statements are being directly or indirectly challenged. This is in strong contrast to the Cambridge or Oxford Unions where anyone who is a member of the "House" may, at any stage, get to

I. S. LLOYD and W. H. L. RICHMOND *composed the Cambridge University Debating Team which spoke in the United States in the spring of 1947. Mr. Lloyd is a graduate of the University of Witwatersrand and of Kings College, Cambridge. He was president of the Cambridge Union in 1947. Mr. Richmond is a student at Trinity College, Cambridge.*

his feet and challenge a statement by addressing the President "on a point of information" or "on a point of order." The speaker challenged has the right of refusing to withdraw on a point of information if he considers the question either frivolous or dangerous. On a point of order affecting the rules of the debate he is obliged to do so. The President, who occupies the chair at all debates, has the complete discretion to allow or disallow all interruptions, but having given his permission, there will follow a question such as the following:

On a point of information, Mr. President, is the honorable member not aware that the figure he has given relating to the National Income of the United States was calculated by Mr. Smith in 1928 and can therefore be presumed to have no relevance whatever to the question under discussion?

The speaker will then turn, if his case allows him to do so, and reply:

If the honorable member had paid more attention to what I was saying he would realize that I was about to deal with the possibility of a recession, and that therefore the figure for 1928 has very considerable relevance to the question we are discussing.

With a little ingenuity such interruptions can be informative, amusing, and frequently devastating. With a little adroitness on the part of the speaker any interruption can be turned very neatly to his own advantage. This system, if properly controlled by a skillful chairman, makes for a lively interchange and is excellent training for a speaker who has to think quickly and answer immediately. It makes the debate "alive" in a sense which is rather difficult to describe to those who have not experienced both systems.

It was our impression that the American debating system, with its highly formalized organization, was a real handicap to the participants in that the platform speakers have to "carry the ball" themselves for the entire evening. And this brings us to our most crucial criticism which is that the audiences are no different from theatre audiences who have come for entertainment. They do not participate in the debate as members of a forum or parliament or congress. Particularly at universities students are unlikely to be enthusiastic about something in which they have no sense of participation. Questions, after it is all over bar the shouting, are a very inadequate substitute for the sense of excitement which arises from taking sides, from the knowledge that one can get to one's feet, if one has the courage, and correct an obvious mis-statement, and most of all from the sense that when the speakers who are supposed to know all about the subject have sat down, one will be able, with some luck, to catch the Chairman's eye and hold forth, if only for a few minutes, to show them exactly where they are wrong.

We were also interested to discover that American University Debating Societies rarely if ever invited outside speakers of distinction, such as Congressmen, Senators, Editors, and Authors, to take part in a debate. This is a regular feature of debates at the Cambridge and Oxford Unions, and its lack in the United States might help in part to explain the difficulty which is experienced in maintaining interest in debating.

The formal time limits we thought to be somewhat rigid in their general application, though we ourselves were accorded the most generous treatment. We were told that others were not so lucky. It is a very important thing for a speaker to learn to judge whether or not he is holding his audience, and to exercise his own judgment as to when to sit down. The somewhat stereotyped fifteen-minute constructive and eight-minute rebuttal arrangement does not assist the

development of this sense. Particularly in major debates on topics of great importance and interest we considered that a better arrangement was to leave the timing to the Chairman's discretion. If the audience is obviously deriving great enjoyment and interest from a speech, it should be allowed to continue within reason. If it is singularly dull and everyone is asleep, the speaker deserves to be cut off after five or six minutes. Only an impartial chairman of considerable experience can exercise such discretion. In general however we found the rebuttal a most enjoyable feature of the debates which should certainly not be abandoned whatever steps are taken towards a more parliamentary system of debate, with audience participation (of members as distinct from visitors) and a greater consequent responsibility for the Chairman.

Very early on we formed the opinion that the American student was singularly fortunate in the interest shown by the university authorities in speech and its related subjects, especially speech therapy, which is almost completely neglected in England. We were astonished at the elaborate organization of some of the departments of speech which we had the privilege of visiting, and at the wide scope of their activities. We nevertheless formed the opinion that this inevitably leads to a tendency to treat public speaking *in vacuo*—more and more speaking with less and less public—and this was confirmed by what we discovered of the normal competitive debates where we were told that an audience, apart from the judges, is an exception rather than the rule. The danger of turning a trained speaker loose who has never faced a large audience is as great as that of producing an actor who is word perfect but is incapable of establishing contact with his audience. This was confirmed by our experience of several debates where our opponents, though they had competent and well-constructed cases, made speeches which resembled a set-piece at a fireworks display—all sparks and no explosion. They failed to get in touch with their audiences, and to vary their approach to suit the reaction of their audiences. This is of course the most accomplished of all arts where public speaking is concerned, but it is an art which cannot be developed from the textbook, or the gramophone recording, or in front of a mirror. In the Cambridge and Oxford Unions the young speaker, whatever he may lack in the finesse and training which skilled coaching such as is given in American universities can provide, does acquire this art from a fairly early stage, for he rarely if ever speaks to less than fifty or sixty people, and he learns by hard experience if he is not "putting it over."

The foundation of any debate is, of course, the subject. It must fulfill three conditions. It must be controversial, it must be interesting to an average audience, and if possible it must be one on which preconceived opinions are either non-existent or not very strong, or very strongly held on both sides. The wording is of great importance. The subjects on our tour were three of our own suggestion, and three (on the United Nations, the British Empire, and Palestine) suggested to us from the United States before we left England. We were somewhat surprised at the incidence of choice, our opponents invariably preferring subjects which they could attempt to prove or disprove by an assemblage of facts to those where the line of argument was somewhat unpredictable and the construction of a speech rather dependent on the co-ordination and development of ideas. Yet those who did choose, what, to us, were the most inter-

esting and more difficult subjects—such as that "progress is an illusion" and that modern education was too biased in favor of the sciences— did extremely well and seemed to thoroughly enjoy arguing on subjects where statistics, if they are kept at all, are not kept in this world. The audiences also seemed to enjoy these debates. Certainly some of our best debates, at West Point, Northwestern, and Williams, were held on these subjects. The United Nations (whether or not it should interfere in domestic affairs) also provided some first-class debates, that at Bowdoin being particularly memorable. Our best debates on the Empire were at Iowa and at American University.

Many whom we met in the course of our tour voiced strong opposition to the number of times they were required to speak on the same subject in various contests, and in this they had our very great sympathy, for nothing is more certainly guaranteed to destroy spontaneous enthusiasm for debating than the repetition of the same subject over and over again. At Cambridge and Oxford the only subject which is ever debated more than once is "That this House has no confidence in His Majesty's Government." Having argued against the dissolution of the Empire, a dull subject, on no less than eight occasions, and having noticed the progressive decline in our own spontaneity and exuberance, we had every sympathy for those who had to reiterate on several successive occasions their opinions on labor's share in management. We believe that a greater variety of subject in American debating would arouse greater appeal and enthusiasm amongst a more substantial proportion of the students than seem at present interested.

This article is intended to be constructively frank and critical and to delineate with some accuracy the conclusions about the American system which we formed on our tour. We hope that it has at least succeeded in being of interest. We considered it a great honor to be the first debating team to visit the United States since the war, and we sincerely hope that the two-way traffic inaugurated by Bates and Cambridge will be one which will continue to our mutual advantage and enjoyment as a regular feature of the forensic scene. To us it was an immensely valuable experience and we are convinced that no obstacles should be allowed to interfere with this interchange of ideas as long as there are subjects worth arguing about. May we in conclusion make an appeal to our former opponents and friends to see that the Oxford team which is visiting you in the fall [of 1947] does not get off lightly!

BRITISH DEBATING IS PARLIAMENTARY

NORMAN J. TEMPLE and EDWARD P. DUNN

AFTER traveling over 8,250 miles and participating in twelve debates in England and Scotland, we of the first post-war American debating team to make an international tour are no longer amazed at the high quality of British statesmanship. There is no doubt in our minds that the British student with political aspirations regards the University Union as the training ground for, and the springboard to, national politics, even as the American debater values his undergraduate debate training as a desirable pre-law experience.

The British debating union is the place for the student to gain experience in meeting audience situations such as are met in actual British political life. Moreover, because the British are, by tradition, actively interested in politics, debates are major events in university life, and the good debater is elevated to the position of popularity and prestige usually reserved in the United States for the athlete.

The British do not sanction tournaments or even inter-university debates, but engage in an active schedule of verbal conflicts between members of their own Union, held weekly as a general rule, and all on different topics. We observed two major types of debate in the Unions we visited. The most common and popular form is the Parliamentary debate, in which the topic is usually a serious one on a political or economic question of the day and in which every procedure is modeled after the national Parliament. As a diversion from the strict Parliamentary debate drawn on political party lines, debates may be of a second major type in which no Parliamentary seating plan is employed and much of the formal procedure is eliminated.

In the Parliamentary style, the debate is conducted along political party lines, with a large number of students from the party in "power" assigned to the various offices of government. The debate is opened by regular speeches, two for the proponents of the motion and two for the opponents, after which the debaters occupying the government offices take over the speaking whenever the debate touches upon the work of their department. Members of the Union attend and are seated according to political party membership, the Conservatives occupying the benches on the right of the hall facing the center, with the leftist groups appropriately on the left, facing the center. Other political groups occupy the "back benches" facing the Speaker. Thus, the seating plan is in the form of a quadrangle, with the political party benches forming three sides and the Speaker at the front of the hall forming the fourth. Such a seating arrangement makes for good clash between opponents who are opposite and facing each other. The audience occupies a gallery which runs around the sides and back of the hall. Four of the universities, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Cambridge, and Oxford, have well-appointed permanent debating halls modeled after

NORMAN J. TEMPLE and EDWARD P. DUNN *composed the Bates College Debating Team which spoke in the British Isles in the fall of 1946. Mr. Temple is now Instructor in Argumentation and Public Speaking, and Acting Director of Debate at Bates College. Mr. Dunn is now a graduate student in History at Harvard University.*

the national Parliament, thereby facilitating the appearance of an actual Parliamentary debate. At the other Unions, any large hall can easily be arranged physically to accomodate the Parliamentary style.

In the second major style of debate, the audience is seated before the platform just as in an American debate, and more attention is concentrated upon the four major speakers. In this second type, however, many of the rules of Parliamentary procedure are retained, such as the interruptions of the major speakers on points of order or information, or the proper method of addressing the Speaker. After the four major speakers have completed their addresses, the debate is turned over to the audience, and any member of it may gain the floor for five minutes. When this second type is employed, the topic under discussion may be either a serious one or a facetious one. If a facetious topic is chosen, the British regard the debate as a "rag" debate with a premium upon humorous and entertaining speeches. Among this type being discussed while we were in Britain were such topics as, "That Monogamy Is Monotonous," or, "That the Old Should Be Seen and Not Heard," or, "That Humor Is No Longer Funny." Among the serious topics was, "That the Conservative Party Has No Political Future." This flexible type of debate is most popular in those Unions not boasting of a permanent Parliamentary style debating hall.

Information on time limits and other procedures of a formal Parliamentary debate may best be imparted through a description of a Parliamentary debate we witnessed and took part in at the University of Glasgow.

The motion was, "That This House Commends His Majesty For His Most Gracious Speech." The night before the debate, handbills were circulated among the members of the University Union, announcing the terms of the Motion and delegating the various offices of "Government" to members of the student Labor Party which was to be in power. On the reverse side of the handbill was a speech written by Labor students, outlining the proposed program of the "Labor Government." Students waited anxiously about the lobby of the Union building until the handbills were distributed, then all scurried back to their rooms in town, or "digs" as they call them, to prepare speeches for the debate.

The debate opened at 1:15 the next afternoon with the formal entry of the Speaker of the House, and the presentation of his symbol of authority, the Mace, brought in by a uniformed Sergeant-at-Arms. A speaker from the Labor Party presented the motion in a ten-minute speech, and was opposed by a speaker acting as leader of the Opposition. These speeches corresponded to our first affirmative and negative speeches. A seconder from each side then spoke for five minutes urging the House either to support or to reject the motion. There were frequent interruptions by members of the House on points of order or information. These interruptions were generally in the form of heckling. For example, during the speech of the Conservative leading the Opposition, a Communist supporter of the motion, who appropriately enough boasted of a heavy red beard, jumped up to ask on a point of information, if the leader of the Opposition was refraining from the wearing of his spectacles (the Conservative was waving them in his hand for emphasis) in order

that he might concentrate his astigmatism upon the mis-interpretation of the speech he was reading. The Conservative came back quickly into the battle of words, when the laughter of ridicule and delight over the heckler's clever and timely interruption had subsided, with the rejoinder, "The bearded gentleman from the Government benches should be the last member of this House to begrudge another member an article of personal adornment." Such ready wit and ability to take it and give it under the heat of verbal combat seem essential if the debater is to make good in terms of British Parliamentary debating.

After an hour of this give and take, the Glasgow "Parliament" adjourned until 7:15 in the evening, and all members went off to study the opening remarks and to prepare speeches for or against the Government's program.

The evening debate was both serious and frivolous. On the serious side, Opposition members would ask such questions as this: "I would like to ask the Honorable Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to explain the Government's position with relation to Palestine." The student debater occupying the Government position mentioned then had to stand before the House and defend the proposed policy, with frequent interruptions for questioning. No poorly informed politician would last long here. So the debate went from one major issue to another, with a huge store of general information being required.

On the frivolous side, an impromptu diversion occurred when an Opposition member began cracking nuts on the back of a bench. When the Labor Party debater could be longer endure the noise of the operation and the subsequent laughter, he finally had to request the Speaker to have the Sergeant-at-Arms silence the offender. Another diversion came when a member delivered a lengthy speech in faultless German, with frequent "Heil Hitler's" interspersed. At one time, the debate on national issues was forgotten in favor of a lively and witty discussion on the correct name for the rostrum used by the speakers. The debate thus alternated between serious and hilarious topics until almost four o'clock in the morning.

Although Parliamentary debates at Cambridge and Oxford would not be without their humor, they would be more dignified and serious affairs. At these two famous Unions, the debates begin at seven-thirty and continue until about midnight. The time limits imposed upon the speakers here, as at most Unions, are quite flexible. A maximum time is stated, lenient enough to accommodate even the most fluent speaker. We were told that a dull speaker who insisted upon using the maximum time allowed (which was as much as thirty minutes in some Unions) would not soon be invited to be a principal speaker in another debate. At both Oxford and Cambridge, debaters serve an apprenticeship in their colleges before being invited to join the central University Union. The principals of the debate usually wear evening clothes and assume all of the dignity and importance of a national member of Parliament. At Oxford, the Union member presenting his maiden speech first has a conference with the Union President, in which the neophyte is indoctrinated with the correct methods and traditions of the Union.

It is worthy of special mention that the audience contributions to the debate were generally on a very high level, frequently superior to the speeches of the principal speakers. This is especially true in the second type of debate des-

cribed above, in which the audience definitely takes over after the four principal speakers. The Chairman (as a carry-over from the Parliamentary style, the term "Speaker" is frequently retained) controls the debate and alternates the speakers from the floor, usually by stating, "I will now recognize a speaker for the motion."

Also worthy of special comment is the fact that these British University Unions are student affairs without benefit of faculty advice or supervision. The Union buildings are student-owned and managed, most of them containing dining hall, snack bar, library, game rooms, lounge, and often a bar. In none of the universities did we find a Speech Department, or even an Instructor in Public Speaking. We are afraid that the British opinion of us was lowered when they learned that we had to be coached before visiting them. The fact that our speeches were co-ordinated in a well-planned case reflected our American training in debate, but did not seem to impress our British cousins.

At many of these student-owned Unions, the officers, on their own initiative, obtain men high in national political life to participate in debates. Thus, at Oxford, the next regular debate following our appearance saw Anthony Eden participating as leader of the Conservative group.

We cannot speak too highly of the generous and warm reception accorded us everywhere, nor can we speak too highly in praise of the large and enthusiastic audiences that participated in our debates. Never shall we forget the masterful Americanized rebuttal of James Hume at the University of Edinburgh, nor the best of Oxford's traditionally good debaters, Peter Kroyer, booming out, "Truman fiddles while Byrnes roams."

In conclusion, we must state that we were definitely impressed by certain features of British debating. We liked the fact that debates are always well attended, and that a large proportion of the student body at each university belongs to the Debating Society or Debating Union. In both types of debate discussed here, but especially in the Parliamentary, we liked the idea of being interrupted whenever we said anything that someone wished to question or refute, for it kept us on our mental toes, so to speak, and also provided an opportunity to silence or answer objections that otherwise might have been forgotten by the time an American rebuttal rolled around. After leaving Britain, we both felt that the idea of having the audience participate actively is largely responsible for the enthusiasm and interest in debates, and is one we might well copy. We believe that the flexible time limits contributed materially to the attainment of a more complete discussion, and to the realization of a more evident conclusion to the problem under discussion.

By inviting outside speakers to participate in collegiate debates, we are sure that the British are making a real and living use of their undergraduate training. They also think that they are obtaining a more balanced and practical training by debating a different topic each week, and we must commend them for the good debates we witnessed, debates filled with many good arguments and sharp clashes despite little time spent in preparation and without conscious attempt at co-ordination.

Not only variety, but also frequency, is the spice of life for the British debater as he realistically trains for the future!

THE WEST POINT DEBATE TOURNAMENT

LAWRENCE J. LEGERE, JR.

WEST POINT cadets receive their formal speech training from the Department of English, since there is no Department of Speech at the Military Academy. In the concluding sessions of a sub-course in public speaking, taken during their fourth-class (freshman) year, they study a few principles and techniques of debate and actually take part in at least one traditional-type debate. All forensic activity at the Academy, other than this brief classroom instruction, is carried on by the West Point Debate Council, a volunteer organization open to all cadets and conducted as an extra-curricular activity. It was this group which planned and executed the first West Point National Invitational Debate Tournament, held on May 2-4, 1947.

The Military Academy did not enter seriously into the field of intercollegiate debating until 1945. Prior to the war the Debating Society, as it was then called, was rarely able to count more than a dozen active members, and meetings with other colleges were infrequent. During the war, because of the acceleration of the study program and the curtailment of unessential travel, the Society was limited to intramural contests. In the spring of 1945, however, when the end of the war was clearly in sight, the restrictions were relaxed slightly, and Academy debaters again met teams from other campuses. In April of that year there was held at West Point a small tournament in which eight schools from the Northeastern area participated. With the opening of the academic year 1945-1946 the Debate Council began in earnest to expand the scope of its activity, and in April of 1946 acted as host for a sixteen-team tournament which, although made up for the most part of Eastern schools, included the University of Chicago, the Ohio State University, and the University of Iowa.

Not long before the end of that academic year the proposal to hold a national tournament in 1947 was advanced. The Council began immediately to take preliminary soundings of professional opinion. During this period of initial investigation invaluable advice was proffered by A. Craig Baird of the University of Iowa, G. M. Musgrave of Des Moines, Iowa, Alan Nichols of the University of Southern California, E. R. Nichols of the University of Redlands, Joseph F. O'Brien of the Pennsylvania State College, and many others.

As a result of the suggestions received, the tournament committee divided the United States into seven geographical regions, and allotted to each from three to six participating teams, the exact number for any region being determined by the extent and quality of forensic activity there. A form letter was sent to over three hundred colleges and universities, requesting the names of the leading teachers of speech in the region and asking for expressions of opinion on the matter of the proposed tournament. Almost all schools replying indicated extreme interest in the plans

MAJOR LAWRENCE J. LEGERE, JR., *was formerly Director of Debate at the United States Military Academy. He is now a Fellow of the Littauer Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University.*

and a willingness to attend, should they be invited. The names of speech teachers were carefully studied, and for each region the three occurring most frequently were selected. These men were invited to serve as members of the regional nominating committees, charged with the responsibility of designating the schools to be invited from their regions. The method of selection—whether by past and current performances or by a regional tournament—was left to the discretion of the committees. While there is not space to list all those who gave so willingly of their time, special mention should be made of the chairmen: E. R. Nichols, University of Redlands; W. H. Veatch, State College of Washington; Ray Rucker, Texas Christian University; T. B. Fest, University of Colorado; Glen Mills, Northwestern University; Wayne Eubank, University of Florida; and Joseph F. O'Brien, Pennsylvania State College. The receipt of the final regional nominations in April virtually marked the end of the planning phase of the tournament.

Of the thirty-two schools nominated, twenty-nine participated. These were: University of Southern California, Arizona State College, University of Utah, University of Colorado, State College of Washington, Oregon State College, Gonzaga University, Southeastern State College of Oklahoma, University of Texas, Louisiana College, Oklahoma Baptist University, Texas Christian University, College of St. Thomas, Northwestern University, Augustana College, Wheaton College, Indiana State Teachers College, Purdue University, Ohio State University, University of Notre Dame, Wake Forest College, University of Mississippi, University of Virginia, United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, Yale University, Pennsylvania State College, Rutgers University, and the University of Vermont. Invited, but unable to attend, were the University of Florida, University of Nebraska, and Nebraska Wesleyan University. Each school sent a faculty coach and one two-man team prepared to debate both sides of the national question, "Resolved: That labor should be given a direct share in the management of industry." The somewhat unusual measure of limiting each school to one team, instead of allowing the customary affirmative team and negative team, had been decided upon during the planning stages as being necessary from the financial point of view of several of the Far Western schools.

The tournament was divided into five seeding rounds and four elimination rounds. Pairings in each of the five seeding rounds had been prearranged by the tournament manager and his assistants, but the schedule for any given round was not distributed until the preceding round had been completed. In establishing the schedules for all five preliminary rounds the criterion used was that, insofar as possible, no school would debate any other school closer than five hundred miles to it, nor would any judge sit on a debate including a school located in the region from which his own college or university had been nominated. Visiting coaches were used as judges in both the seeding and elimination rounds, one for each debate prior to the elimination period and three for each contest thereafter, except for the final debate, on which five judges voted. In seeding teams for qualification in the elimination rounds, the manager and his staff gave primary consideration to the number of debates won. As between teams which had won an equal number

of debates in the preliminary rounds, the tournament manager and his staff rated according to the totals of an individual point-scoring system which each judge had filled out on his ballot. The first two preliminary rounds were held on Friday afternoon, May 2nd; the third, Friday evening; and the fourth and fifth, Saturday morning.

With the beginning of the elimination rounds on Saturday afternoon the usual minor administrative difficulties multiplied, but were satisfactorily resolved by agreement among the coaches and tournament managers. In the semi-final round, held Saturday evening, Southeastern State College of Oklahoma defeated the United States Military Academy, and the University of Southern California defeated the University of Notre Dame. The final round on Sunday afternoon resulted in a 3-2 decision in favor of Southeastern State College. Major General Maxwell D. Taylor, Superintendent of the Military Academy, made the formal presentation of the tournament trophy to the winning students. The trophy, a large silver loving cup of classic design, had been donated by Mr. Sigurd S. Larmon, president of Young and Rubicam, Inc., and an active debater at Dartmouth in his undergraduate days.

We at the Military Academy do not overestimate the importance of our national tournament. The primary purpose of the Debate Council is to train as many cadets as possible in the principles and techniques of sound public speaking, without attempting to develop a mere handful of experts in the field of undergraduate debating. We do, however, feel that our tournament not only has its place, but satisfies a long-standing need in intercollegiate forensics. The values of tournament debate are multiplied when representation is nation-wide. The exchange of ideas, techniques, and approaches to the question, the concentration of experience, and the spirit of competition all improve when the geographical distribution of teams is widespread. Until 1947 the only national tournaments had been those restricted to certain forensic fraternity groups; the West Point tournament is open to any college or university nominated or otherwise selected to attend, regardless of location, size, or fraternity affiliation.

The Military Academy is well suited to sponsor such an annual event. Although located in New York, it is itself a national institution with students from all forty-eight states in the same proportion as the representation of the states in Congress. Sufficient facilities are available for the comfortable accommodation of a large group at no expense to the visiting schools.

The recent tournament was an experiment, but it was on the whole very successful. Many helpful suggestions have been received which will aid us in our future efforts, for we are looking forward to the spring of 1948 and the Second Annual West Point National Invitational Debate Tournament.

A NOTE ON CHAMPIONSHIP DEBATERS

DONALD E. HARGIS

SINCE it was organized in 1917 the Michigan High School Forensic Association has held twenty-seven State Championship Debates with 154 debaters taking part. In an effort to discover who these debaters were, what they did in high school, and what they have done since high school, as well as to find out what their reactions are to contest debating, questionnaires were sent to school principals and to debaters. A questionnaire was sent for each debater to the principal of every school which has taken part in a Michigan High School Forensic Association Championship Debate. Questions were asked about scholastic standing, leadership, extra-curricular activities, college attendance, present occupation, and other significant factors on which administrators might wish to comment. 131 replies were received. The replies report some definite characteristics common to almost all championship debaters.

In scholastic standing 84% of the debaters were in the upper 20% of their graduating classes and 66% in the upper 10%, while only 6% were considered average. No debater was reported as below average. 52% had an average letter grade of A or A-, and 90% a record of B- or better. All of the debaters were graduated from high school. Hence, it seems obvious that nearly all of the champion debaters had excellent records of scholarship and were scholastic leaders in their classes.

On the question, "Was the debater considered a leader in high school?" 82% answered yes, 11% answered no, and 7% of the questionnaires had no answer. All of the principals indicated that the students had taken part in at least one extra-curricular activity beyond debate and many in two or three and up to ten or eleven. Public speaking activities, other than debate, in which 69% took part, were the most popular after debate. Dramatics attracted 37%, student government 40%, clubs 30%, athletics 46%, musical activities 15%, and journalism 46%. While the actual percentages are comparatively unimportant, it is interesting to note the variety and number of extra-curricular activities, aside from debate, in which these individuals participated. All were in at least two activities, and most had several activities to their credit.

70% of the debaters attended college; 5% did not, and no answer was given to this question by 25% of the principals. 40% graduated from college. The college attendance ranged from one semester to eight years. These students attended a wide variety of colleges (twenty-seven) with the greatest percentage, 27%, attending the University of Michigan. The percentage of students going on to college is above the general average and is not surprising in view of the scholastic records and wide interests of the students.

Only 63% of the questionnaires indicated what occupation or profession the individual debater is at present following. As one might expect, 18% are either in the armed forces or in the process of being separated. 10% are

DONALD E. HARGIS is *Instructor in Public Speaking at the University of California at Los Angeles and was formerly manager of the Michigan High School Forensic Association.*

practicing law, 10% are teaching, 4% are housewives, and 3% are engineers. The rest are distributed in nine other professions or occupations.

Practically all of the returned questionnaires contained comments on the individual debaters. These comments indicate that high school principals considered the championship debaters to be outstanding in every respect: in scholarship, leadership, personality, activities, and professional success after high school. Many comments were made upon the distinctive personalities of these debaters and the leadership which they demonstrated both in and outside of the classroom. Without exception, the students were evaluated as scholastic leaders, with many of them receiving university scholarships upon graduation from high school. The superior intelligence of the group was universally acknowledged. While it is impossible to indicate all of the specific comments in this summary, it is apparent that school administrators consider the championship debaters to have been the distinguished citizens in their schools.

Individual questionnaires were sent to forty-seven debaters whose addresses were secured on the original questionnaires. This was done in an attempt to discover the debaters' reactions to their debating experiences. On all of the twenty-nine replies received, the debaters agreed that high school debate was worth-while; that they, as ex-debaters, would recommend that a student in high school today take part in debate; that debate helped them in life after high school; and that if they were in high school today they would debate. The reactions to the values of debate were many and varied, but all were favorable to contest debating.

The most universally expressed reaction was that debate gave the individual self-confidence and assurance, that it gave the debater poise, and that it dissipated stage fright. Many comments were made on the effects of debating on the thinking and mental processes. The point of these comments was that the individual secured training in logic and the use of logic in active thought and so was able to use the mind more readily and more quickly than would have been possible otherwise. The third emphasis was on the development, through debate experience, of personal proficiency and poise in speaking. A fourth value listed was the fact that debating aroused interest in questions of public concern. And the last value stated was that debate stimulated habits of thorough investigation and seeking after truth. All of the comments can be summarized under these headings, and the commentators were enthusiastic in their statements of the values.

The former debaters had few suggestions for changing the present contest debate program. All of those which were made were minor technical suggestions which in no way influence the fundamental debate process as it is now practiced. Only one individual suggested that more emphasis be placed on group discussion and cross-question debate.

Naturally one might expect championship debaters to be the leaders in all respects in high school life. However, this survey demonstrates the leadership which they possess. It also shows the appeal which debate has for the exceptional student and the values which he attributes to his debating experiences. These reactions of principals and debaters should be of interest, not only to debate coaches, but also to teachers of public speaking generally.

A NATIONAL THEATRE IN AMERICA

C. LAWTON CAMPBELL

CAN we establish a national theatre in the United States, a theatre sufficiently decentralized so that it operates in every state of the Union? Can we extend and expand the living theatre so that it will be available to every citizen of the country, national in scope but regional in initiative? Can we raise the standards of the legitimate drama to the status of a vital social force throughout the length and breadth of this great land of ours?

These are questions that have challenged the best minds among disciples of the theatre for a long time. But these questions have remained unanswered, at least as far as action is concerned, until recently when ANTA evolved a plan for a national decentralized theatre, a plan to stimulate theatre activity according to the needs of each individual state, a plan for a national foundation, which will act as a reservoir to develop and to finance the realization of these latent ideals.

First, what is ANTA? ANTA is the abbreviated name of the American National Theatre and Academy, a non-profit making corporation, organized under the aegis of a charter granted by the Congress of the United States in July, 1935. This charter is one of the very few granted by Congress in its entire history, and the only one ever granted in the field of the drama. The American Red Cross and the Smithsonian Institution, to name only two of the very few organizations formed under Congressional charters, have lived up to their charters. It is the avowed determination of the officers and Board of Directors of ANTA to see that the responsibilities of its charter are fulfilled and maintained. Primarily, the chief responsibility of this charter is to stimulate the theatre in every state of the Union.

COLONEL C. LAWTON CAMPBELL *is Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Theatre and Academy. He is a graduate of Princeton University and has long been interested in the professional theatre.*

History and Corporate Structure

Shortly after ANTA was granted its charter, the Federal Theatre came into existence. Those who controlled the destinies of ANTA at that time did not feel that their organization could compete with a federal theatre, subsidized by the government and in reality, a relief project. So ANTA marked time When the Federal Theatre folded, ANTA started making plans anew, but then came World War II and ANTA halted again. After the war, late in 1946, ANTA took a new lease on life. Plans to fulfill the responsibilities of its charter, and specifically plans to establish a national decentralized theatre were formulated and the initial steps taken.

The corporate structure of ANTA at present consists of officers and a Board of Directors, which numbers 48 members and is representative of the number of states in the Union. The officer personnel consists mainly of men and women with a broad experience in the professional theatre. The Board is made up, not only of leaders in the theatre and allied arts, but of critics, lawyers, college professors, bankers, heads of national organizations, and

business executives, located in many different parts of the country. In addition to the Board and officers, there is a corporate membership, set at present at 500. Every state in the Union is represented in this membership and 70 percent is located outside New York. This percentage will increase in favor of the country-at-large as ANTA's activities become more nation-wide. These members are invited by the Board and have a vote on the policies and plans of the organization at the annual meetings.

There is another type of membership known as the subscribing members, and these members will play a vital role in the future of ANTA. They will be the local and regional representatives, along with the more limited number of corporate memberships, in ANTA's drive for a national foundation. Although there has been no organized campaign for subscribing membership, the response through personal contacts so far, from individuals, groups and organizations interested in the aims of ANTA indicates that there are thousands, perhaps millions, of theatre enthusiasts throughout the country ready and eager to join with ANTA in establishing a national theatre in their own state and own home town.

Of necessity, the headquarters of ANTA had to be in New York. That city is, of course, the fountainhead of professional theatre activity in this country, and it must be used as a base in the beginning of any national theatre program. However, it is conceivable that once ANTA is established, the headquarters should be more centrally located.

Accomplishments to Date

Second, what has ANTA accomplished in the past twelve months of its new lease on life towards stimulating the theatre and towards a decentralization of the theatre on a national scale?

One of the major responsibilities of ANTA in the charter is the development of new talent for the theatre.

On the basis of this authority, the officers of ANTA decided that the first plank in its new program, pending necessary funds for more extensive national activity, would be to establish a graduate academy, where new talent from all over the country could have a year's training in New York under experienced professional direction. A sound plan for competitive scolarships was evolved, and the Princess Theatre in New York was leased as the site of the academy. ANTA was ready to take its first decisive step to fulfill at least one phase of its chartered responsibilities, but it was soon discovered that sufficient funds were not available to establish the academy on the level of high standards projected in the plan. So ANTA temporarily pigeon-holed the plan for the academy and decided to re-activate the Experimental Theatre at the Princess.

The Experimental Theatre had once before attempted a career of promise but had fallen by the wayside because of the lack of proper support. This theatre offered the opportunity of developing new talent for the theatre. The emphasis in the Experimental Theatre was to be more on the new playwright. As conceived by ANTA, the Experimental Theatre would not only offer opportunity for new playwrights with new ideas to see their plays in rehearsal and finally in production before an audience, but would also offer a laboratory for directors with new techniques and a broader field for actors with genuine talent, all free from commercial restraint and restrictions.

As its first active step in New York, ANTA did re-activate the Experimental Theatre, but it was a hard nut to crack. Day after day ANTA worked with Actors' Equity, the Dramatists' Guild, and the theatre craft unions. ANTA struck at the roots of many of the barriers which have so beset the commercial theatre. All sides had to give in, to make concessions, if the productions were to keep within the limited budgets. Several months passed in negotiations. At times it seemed as if ANTA had tackled the impossible. But finally all sides made concessions and the Experimental Theatre became a reality. Five new plays by new playwrights were produced. New directors were developed and many actors had a chance to rise from a "walk-on" to important roles. It is true that this first season did not produce another Eugene O'Neill, but it did serve as an inspiration to the new playwrights to strive for better work in the future, and it brought to the commercial theatre a wealth of hitherto undiscovered talent. What the first season of the Experimental Theatre did prove above all else was that through a non-profit making organization such as ANTA the opposing forces of the theatre can be brought together and made to see that the future of the theatre depends on cooperation among all the elements of the theatre. Although not the artistic success as might have been impatiently desired, the Experimental Theatre none the less received the Sidney Howard Memorial Award as the outstanding new development in the theatre during the 1946-7 season. After twenty years of talk, it is the first continuously operating, completely professional Experimental Theatre to function in New York. Another point that can be made for the Experimental Theatre is that it established a standard of procedure which has already stimulated other organizations throughout the country to branch out along experimental lines. The Experimental Theatre will continue under ANTA sponsorship during the 1947-8 season and it appears to have an assured place in the reviving theatre.

Fight For Repertory

Next on the chronological agenda came the case of the American Repertory Theatre. This worthy organization, dedicated to a high standard of repertory, reached an impasse in January, 1947. Having produced four plays that were, as was generally admitted, of considerable merit, the company was ready to go into production with its fifth play, when the operating costs mounted to the point where it seemed unlikely that the season of repertory could continue. The Repertory theatre appealed to ANTA. Believing that a strong stand should be taken in favor of the repertory idea in the American theatre, ANTA came to the rescue. ANTA organized a theatre committee, which met with the unions, obtained concessions, and raised the necessary funds so that the American Repertory Theatre could continue.

Up to this time, ANTA had no deliberate plan of promotion or of publicity. But soon word of the achievements of the Experimental Theatre and of the case of the American Repertory spread, particularly in the direction of the theatre-minded and of producing groups throughout the country. In a matter of weeks, the ANTA office became the mecca for many of those who wanted to have the theatre survive, stimulated, and expanded. Local producers hastened from the South and the West. Representatives of embryonic producing groups flooded ANTA with appeals for advice and help. Civic-mind-

ed citizens from all parts of the country wrote, many coming in person, to find out how ANTA could cooperate in establishing a state theatre in their home state or a professional theatre in their home town. All of this indicated for the record what ANTA had believed, namely that the desire for theatre that is decentralized is ardent and that people all over America are waiting for some organization to come along to carry the banner, to pave the way, and to give the professional advice needed.

Steps Toward Decentralization

Some examples of what happened in various parts of the country under ANTA's guidance and sponsorship in a few months of intense, almost volcanic activity, will illustrate how ANTA plans for decentralization of the theatre on a national basis.

The State of Utah celebrated the one-hundredth anniversary of its founding in 1947. One of the most important projects planned for this centennial celebration was a dramatic festival. Utah has always been a good theatre state. In fact, one of the first buildings erected in Salt Lake City by its founder, Brigham Young, was a theatre. The people of Utah are theatre minded, although the commercial theatre has passed them by lately, with only an occasional nod. The sponsors of the dramatic festival had to meet a challenge to present a season of plays worthy of the tradition of the state. The sponsors turned to ANTA for help and advice. The result was surprising even to the most critical theatre enthusiasts. With ANTA's collaboration, the Drama Festival of the Centennial presented Katharine Cornell in "The Barretts of Wimpole Street," Judith Evelyn in "Joan of Lorraine," and Orson Welles in "Macbeth." So successful, financially and artistically, was the dramatic festival, that there is a movement afoot in Utah now to make this festival an annual affair and, in all probability, it may be the beginning of a state theatre in Utah. In "Joan of Lorraine" and in "Macbeth," the majority of the minor parts and even some major parts were played by local talent and dramatic students from the University of Utah. An excellent example this is, of the union of professional artists and student talent, which is such an important phase in the development of the decentralized theatre.

Dallas Theatre '47

Dallas is another case in point. This thriving Texas community has always been a "good theatre town." But with the dwindling number of road companies and in spite of a very active little theatre, Dallas wanted more professional theatre available to its citizens. Under the spirited leadership of Margo Jones, a successful and well-known Broadway director, the theatre lovers of Dallas rallied and raised the requisite funds for the Dallas Theatre '47. They obtained a theatre and were ready to go ahead when Miss Jones found it difficult to secure the rights for the scripts desired and to attract professional players from the commercial theatre to Dallas for a season of plays. Then Miss Jones turned to ANTA for assistance. With the cooperation of Actors' Equity and the Dramatists' Guild, ANTA was able to secure the contracts necessary and the personnel of professional experience and ability sought for the Dallas Theatre. The season of repertory in Dallas is now history. It was a great success, financially and artistically, and it achieved a happy blending of the best of the professional theatre and of local talent. The Dallas Theatre shows every sign of becoming a permanent landmark in

Dallas, rather than an experiment in 1947.

One of the most enterprising speech and drama departments is that of the Catholic University in Washington, D. C. It has a fine record of excellent productions in the past, many of which were later transplanted to Broadway and Hollywood. Encouraged by the success of the Experimental Theatre in New York, the Catholic University Theatre decided to present a playwriting festival from June, 1947 through May, 1948, to be devoted entirely to new plays by new playwrights. An appeal came to ANTA to sponsor this festival and ANTA accepted the sponsorship along with the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. The first play opened in June, 1947, and the critical reviews in Washington and New York papers were most encouraging. They indicated that the Festival has set a high standard in the direction of the development of that most needed of all contributory factors to the future theatre, the new playwright. Each play produced so far has run three weeks, and by the close of the Festival in May, 1948, twelve new plays by new playwrights will have been produced.

In addition to these three examples, ANTA has cooperated in the plans and promotion of the San Francisco Theatre Association, the Virginia State Theatre, the Jamestown Festival, the Detroit Drama Guild, and many others. In every case, the supporters and promoters of these groups had the desire, generally the finances, and sometimes even the theatre, but they were a long way from Broadway and Broadway was not interested. ANTA proved to be the clearing house, through which arrangements with professional players, playwrights, directors, and the craft unions could be channeled and the contracts agreed upon. ANTA was the meeting ground between the professional theatre and the far-flung supporters of the theatre from all parts of the country. The theatre had never before had a service organization with non-profit making intentions and with no other aim but to help the theatre in all its diversified, complicated, and diffused ramifications. There existed a great, almost insurmountable gap between the professional theatre and the non-professional theatre. That gap had to be filled before a national decentralized theatre could come into existence, and ANTA is constantly filling that gap.

National Foundation

Third, how does ANTA plan to finance its far-reaching plans for a national decentralized theatre? ANTA plans to build a national foundation from funds to be raised through a nation-wide appeal to the American people. So far, the expenses of the organization have been met by contributions, mainly from members of the Board of Directors, by a few life-memberships, by dues received from a few hundred corporate members, and by the smaller dues of a thousand subscribing members. To carry out the ambitious program for a national decentralized theatre, ANTA will have to have many millions of dollars. ANTA expects to raise this money because it believes that once the American public is aware of the great need, the people of this country will respond whole-heartedly.

The campaign for a national drive for funds will start early in 1948. A few test campaigns on a limited scale are already under way and they show very encouraging signs. Once started, the drive will be continuous across the

country, and it may later result in an annual drive similar to those of the Red Cross and the Community Chests. One point that will be stressed in all regional and local campaigns is that the funds received in any one state or community will be used as far as possible to develop and stimulate the theatre in that state or community.

The great National Theatres of France, Holland, Belgium, and Czechoslovakia are financed by their governments. In England, there is no national theatre as such, but there is government support to the Arts Council, which underwrites play production and to date has underwritten (in one form or another) hundreds of productions by touring and resident repertory companies. It was the Arts Council that underwrote the Old Vic and John Gielgud's Haymarket Repertory Companies. It is interesting to note that before the British Government participated in the financing of the Arts Council, the initial activity of this group was financed from a foundation of $8,000,000 given, ironically enough, by an American millionaire.

The question of a government subsidy to finance at least part of the foundation for ANTA has been considered. It is the opinion of the Board of ANTA that a government subsidy would be most difficult to obtain at present, and only after ANTA had established its program and proved its worth, would there be a possibility of such a contribution. So ANTA's plans for the present do not depend on the hope of any help from the government. The plan is to go ahead and appeal for that help from the American people directly.

There is one characteristic of the American people which should augur well for the future of ANTA and in turn for a national decentralized theatre. We Americans are a peculiar race. We sit complacent and quiescent or we grumble within four walls. Then a day comes when we get a chance to speak and when we speak, we shake the world. We have done this with our government, with depressions, and with war. All we need is enough pent-up desire and the right channel for our expression. When the opportune moment arrives, we unite and we fight. When we fight, we win. ANTA believes that the people of this country want a vital, living theatre available to all, and not limited to side shows on Broadway and in the Loop. ANTA believes that the people of this country will respond wholeheartedly to an appeal that will bring the best in the theatre to their home towns. ANTA has started the ball rolling already, has proved that it intends to live up to the responsibilities of its charter, and has dedicated its mission to the ideals of that charter. ANTA believes that every theatre lover in the country will rally to the call with the support, the enthusiasm, and the fighting spirit necessary to reach the goal of its aims—a *truly* national, decentralized theatre in the United States of America.

E. L. BULWER AND VICTORIAN CENSORSHIP

CHARLES H. SHATTUCK

ONE of the reasons usually set down for the low degree of English drama in the early ninteenth century is official censorship, as practised by the Lord Chamberlain's Examiner and Licenser of Plays. Certainly that censorship was inhibitive. For twelve years, from 1824 to 1836, the office was held by George Colman the Younger, and the body of that gentleman's opinions is notorious—an almost comical record of prudishness and dog-in-office meddling. Being a man of simple intellect, Colman saw his office in simple terms: "My duty," he said, "is simply to object to everything immoral or politically dangerous." And what did he take to be *immoral?* Since he was known all his life for the profanity and scurrility of his writings and conversation, we might expect at least a refreshing answer, but no. Once he acceded to the censor's chair he became a sort of cast iron saint, adopting as fact, but without the least trace of passion or principle, all those limitations and restrictions of the Prynnes and Colliers of an earlier day. "Devilish good jokes" were immoral, he declared—revealing his insincerity by the very vulgarity of his phrase. Oaths and imprecations were immoral. It was immoral to speak any of the following words—*Lord, God, Heaven, Hell,* or *Damn*—on the stage. *Oh La* and *Oh Lud* were modifications of *Oh Lord; Oh Providence* meant *Oh Heaven; Demme* meant *Damn me*: so these must be struck out too. All references to Scripture were immoral because they were profane: a lover might not call his lady an *angel,* because angels were characters in Scripture. No play might present priests, nuns, altars, crucifixes, or any religious songs or ceremonies, because such profanation was immoral.

And what was *politically* dangerous? He banned Sir Martin Archer Shee's *Alasco* because it was "built upon conspiracies, and attempts to revolutionize a state"—in spite of the fact that the fable of *Alasco* had not the remotest connection with England of the 1820's or any other modern state. He banned Mary Russell Mitford's *Charles I* because it included regicide—as if that cheery, bumptious, sentimental little country bluestocking had designs upon the life of George IV. He struck out of scripts all references to tyrants and tyranny, oppression, liberty, slavery, plots, cabals, conspiracies, and revolutions. The very words, he believed, might inflame the lower classes to rise against the government.

When reminded that most of his bugaboos, moral and political, occur in Shakespeare, and hence were spoken from the stage nightly, he admitted a regret that he could not see his way clear to alter Shakespeare. When reminded that they occur in his own plays, he disposed of the implication with the remark that "he did his business as an author at that time, and he would do his business as an examiner now."[1]

I

Colman was a stupid man, of course, a man without principle, who behaved

CHARLES H. SHATTUCK *is Assistant Professor of English and Associate Director of the Illini Theatre Guild at the University of Illinois.*

[1] A full account of Colman's career as Examiner is given in *Censorship in England,* by Frank Fowell and Frank Palmer (London, 1913).

in a reactionary manner because he thought he was supposed to and because nobody told him otherwise. Doubtless he did some harm. The twelve years of his censorship are probably the dreariest years in the history of English drama. Just before him were the plays of Maturin, Sheil, and Mitford, and the first plays of Knowles. Immediately after him came Bulwer, Talfourd, and Browning. During his time, very nearly nothing (only mountains of trashy farce and melodrama) warrants serious attention.

But let us not be too severe with Colman, or too impatient with the government which sanctioned his office. It is sometimes true in the history of censorship that absurd and excessive zeal, like Colman's, serves finally in the cause of freedom—public opinion piling up like floodwater behind a dam until at last it rushes through, or around, or over, and in the final tumult of passage sweeps a great mass of ancient debris with it. Thus at the end of the same century certain successors to Colman's post—the notorious Piggott and Redford—through their mulish resistance to Ibsen and Maeterlinck stirred the whole literary world of England into counter-resistance. The proponents of freedom have never won their ultimate objective, the abolishment of the Licenser's Office, but they have won some good fights.

The significance of Colman's tenure as Examiner is that no worthy foe rose to meet him. A few scattered persons—authors, actors, and managers—were annoyed when his proscriptions or his lust for fees invaded their pockets. But there was no concerted resistance to him on intellectual grounds. There could not be. The spirit of the age could not foster such resistance, for the spirit of the age, so far as public art was concerned, was reactionary too. The significance of Colman's judgments is that it only exaggerated—it did not run counter to—the prevailing opinions of the time.

The proof lies in the consequence of his tenure—and here is the point I wish to make emphatic. When Colman died, in 1836, his place was filled in turn by Charles and John Mitchell Kemble. The Kembles were neither of them prudes or fools. They instantly abandoned all of Colman's silly rule-of-thumb standards, performed their nominal duties as moderately and inconspicuously as possible, and let plays go upon the boards with relatively minor hindrance. But do not imagine that the British public rose to cheer this rescue from the ogre, this new-found liberty of opinion and speech. Public opinion and the Press, it turned out, were as fussily intolerant as Colman himself, and now lacking a Colman, they had to impose their own check upon dramatists by public clamor. At times, after 1836, they censured the censors for failing to censor. Public opinion, which then as now is unfit to establish morality, and can pass only on rule-of-thumb systems of surface decorum, asserted its own censorship, and woe to the dramatist who crossed its limit lines. So it is not only in the Lord Chamberlain's office, but in the cesspools of Public Opinion that we must find out the restrictive laws governing the drama of the times.

II

The theatrical career of Edward Bulwer is an extremely interesting case in point, for a variety of reasons. Like Browning, the only other notable literary figure of the time who contributed to the theatre, his first play appeared in 1837, just after the Colman regime had ended. Officialdom gave him little

trouble: I doubt that the Kembles ever blotted a line that he wrote. But censorship—unofficial but most potent—was furiously at work and its pressures were compelling. Bulwer offended that censorship in his first plays, and took a smart slapping. He learned his lesson, yielded, and found how to make plays that would suit. He emerged from the ordeal as the most successful "respectable" dramatist of the time.

Bulwer began his efforts at playwriting as early as 1831, apparently in abysmal ignorance of what would do upon the stage. One subject abandoned, and replaced later by a novel, was Eugene Aram, in which he would have dealt sympathetically with a notorious murderer. Another, which he actually completed, but never published, was concerned with Oliver Cromwell, and dealt interestedly with regicide. It is easy to guess George Colman's opinion if he had ever had to pass upon these two plays. *Moral obliquity* and *subversive politics* were Bulwer's original sins, according to the Colman credo, as we gather from the fragmentary remnants of these two plays. And strangely enough these same two sins are exactly the sins of his next two plays, which were finished and produced, and were judged by Public Opinion.

First came *The Duchess de la Valliere*, produced at Covent Garden Theatre on January 4, 1837. It had been written nearly two years earlier, but by a series of contretemps its production had been delayed, so that it passed through the Lord Chamberlain's office after Colman's death. Kemble licensed it without a word of protest. But the Public rejected it unmistakably (it failed in eight nights), and the main reason was its "shocking immorality." The Press, almost in one voice, cried shame.

No casual reader of *La Valliere* nowadays would suspect that he handles the pitch that defiles. He may be bored by the prettiness, the baldness, or the rotundity of the "poetry," he may be sadly amused by the "wit"—but he will not likely suffer profound moral shock. Taken by itself *La Valliere* is tedious reading, but taken together with the critical pronouncements which attended its first curtain, it becomes a fascinating document. Here lie the dusty relics of our great-grandfathers' idea of sin.

The story of the play would seem pious enough—too much so, indeed, for Bulwer has smeared piety over a history where little existed. He has represented Louise de la Valliere as a tenderly idealistic heroine, and Louis Quatorze as a mere debaucher of virtue. He has converted Bragelone, who was actually a young man of more passion than sense, and who committed suicide when Louise forsook him, into a man of middle age, wise, noble, heroic, and holy, who first as a soldier, then as a monk, appears to Louise at the crucial moments of her career to draw her back to paths of virtue. The two main actions are Louise's two flights to the nunnery. The first, which in reality was prompted by a fit of jealousy, Bulwer represents as an act of penance. The second, which actually took place long after the King had cast her off, Bulwer represents as a hardly won moral victory, the King in hot pursuit of her to the very convent-gates.

By all this labored reconstruction, this stern purgation of vulgar truth, Bulwer believed that he had achieved a highly moral tragedy. His critics[2] thought not.

[2] Criticism of *La Valliere* is quoted or cited from the following periodicals:
The Atlas, Jan. 7, 1837.
The Athenaeum, Jan. 7, 1837.
John Bull, Jan. 8, 1837.

(Footnote Continued on Page 68)

> The subject of the drama . . . was ill chosen [said the Atlas]. The story of the wretched *Louise de la Valliere* is unfit for representation; it is revolting to the moral feelings . . . it resolves itself, at the best, into a common case of court vice; and there is nothing left for generous pity, nothing for the sympathies of virtue, nothing which can reconcile the mind to the loathly progress of refined levity and degrading guilt.

The *Athenaeum* found the subject "necessarily . . . a painful one to a right-minded audience"; found "the 'immoral' . . . much more conspicuous in this piece than the moral"; and was reminded of "that compound of German horrors with French libertinism, which seems to be the pride and aim of the modern French drama." *John Bull* ironically declared the British audience too "old fashioned" to take pleasure in it. To the *Spectator* the play was "maudlin inanities," "indecent profanity," "revolting mockeries of sentiment," "the pathos of the stews." And surely the ghost of George Colman stood at the shoulder of the critic for *The Times:*

> This appears to us a very dull and a very foolish play. The subject is a revolting one, and it has not been handled with ability. No man, we think, but one whose vanity had been flattered most extravagantly within the circle of his own little coterie—no man who felt a due respect for the rules even of that *Bienseance* by which society is generally governed, would have ventured to produce a drama, the subject of which is the heartless debaucheries of a profligate monarch and his equally profligate courtiers. What useful or just sentiment does the piece convey? It is in the worst taste of the worst school—the school of modern French romance. We have all but an enforcement under the crucifix, and in a temple consecrated to religious worship! This may pass in Paris, where jaded roués and faded demi-reps require the stimulus of blasphemy to rouse their exhausted passions; but in England the public mind is, thank God, yet too healthy to demand such abominable incentives.

The fastidiousness of these critics, observe, cut two ways. "All but an enforcement" was one thing; "under the crucifix" was another. Bulwer was damned not only for staging immoral sexual relations, but also for staging the language and emblems of religion. The cross to which La Valliere clings when the King comes to drag her from the convent raised a storm of displeasure.[3] The dénouement, in which Louise takes the veil, was generally censured, and, as tragic cartharsis, was wholly misunderstood. Perhaps the most interesting protests of all were those raised against specific items of vocabulary. Bulwer wrote the word "Heaven" many times in the course of his five acts. The critic of the *Monthly Review,* having quoted one passage containing it, is transformed to a pillar of fire:

> This extract contains not the only expression and application to heaven in this play, which is shockingly irreverent. There occur such words as these, "O Father, bless her," which, we are happy to learn, were received by the audience . . . with the most unqualied testimonies of disapprobation. Really novel and play-writers should remember, that if they spend their days in catering for public amusement, the least thing that can be demanded of them is that their works be harmless—that they offer no glaring indignity to the most solemn and precious feeling which religion has fostered.

III

We may be amused by this old-fashioned morality, we may deplore it; but we must not minimize its efficacy or its strength. Bulwer and his friends were inclined to dismiss it as the splenetic invention of his enemies—"a vast deal of disgusting cant," as D'Israeli called it.[4]

The Literary Gazette, Jan. 7, 1837.
The Monthly Review, Feb., 1837.
The Spectator, Jan. 7, 1837.
The Westminster Review, April, 1837.
The Times, Jan. 5, 1837.

[3] Edward Fitzball, *Thirty Five Years of a Dramatic Author's Life* (London, 1859), II. 54.

[4] The Earl of Lytton, *The Life of Edward Bulwer* (London, 1913), I. 530-1.

Granting that many of these critics, for political reasons, eagerly desired to destroy Bulwer's reputation, yet we must remember that they would employ the most cogent and credible means. *La Valliere* was vulnerable in many points which the critics passed lightly. They would not have used the "moral" attack if they had not felt strongly on the subject, and if they had not been certain that the average theatre-goer would concur in the "truth" of their accusations.

Nor were the enemy-critics alone. Bulwer's friends in the press regretfully joined them. Thus, William Jerdan, of the *Literary Gazette*, had to admit that "it is impossible to place Louis on the stage," that he "can never be other than the selfish voluptuary." William Johnson Fox, who reviewed the play for the *Westminster Review* at Bulwer's own request, arrived at the conclusion that morally the subject was unsound and the handling of it faulty.

And the final confirmation comes from Bulwer himself. When he wrote the play, he had little notion of what a cruel shock he was preparing for his honest countrymen. In a letter to Macready he explained that he had cut out a scene which involved putting the horns on M. de Montespan, because it was "*un trop peu fort*—I mean not *trop fort* in itself, but *trop fort* for the starch of the audience."[5] Except for that, he voiced no fears of offending. Once rebuked, however, he bowed to the yoke. He cut down the number of sacred expletives. "Lord of Hosts," he wrote to Macready, was to become "Merciful Heavens" ("it makes the same metre and is more safe"); "Heaven is less merciful" was toned down to "Fate is less Merciful." He tried to solidify the moral import of the ending—to "convey a moral or claptrap to the audience" is his own expression—by changing Bragelone's last words, "O Father, bless her!" to "Accept, Oh Heaven, Earth's worthiest offering—a repentant heart!"[6] Later on, when preparing a new edition of the play, he deleted much more. The comic under-plot of the cuckolding of de Montespan—indeed, the whole character of de Montespan—is cut away. The Queen, who never was much, is reduced to nothing, in order to lessen the appearance of Louise's criminality. All stage-directions referring to crucifixes and other holy objects, and a number of lines suggestive of Divinity are altered or suppressed.

IV

Bulwer's second play, *The Lady of Lyons; or, Love and Pride*, produced February 15, 1838, at Covent Garden, under the management of Macready, was a spectacular and long-lived success; but the first few weeks of its existence were hazardous. Like *La Valliere*, it passed the official censor without objection, only to take a painful drubbing from the hands of the unofficial guardians of order. But the reason for the drubbing was not the same. Bulwer steered free of the perils of sex and religion, but he now ran foul of the other peril—politics. The scene of *The Lady of Lyons*, unfortunately, is Napoleonic France, and the theme involves the social effects of the Revolution: the nobility is criticized and made fun of. We alternately pity and despise the heroine for her desire to marry a title. The only nobleman in the cast is the villain. The hero is a mere gardener's son, who manages, by earnest cultivation of his "natural nobility," to rise to heights of virtue and power quite

[5] *The Letters of Bulwer to Macready*, ed. by Brander Matthews (Newark, 1911), letter no. V.

[6] *Ibid.*, letters no. XI and XII.

beyond the reach of ordinary heirs of title. As his fortunes progress he pauses at times to reflect upon what the word nobility really means. When the heroine insists that there is "something glorious in the heritage of command" and that "a man who has ancestors is like a representative of the past," he gravely corrects her. "Not to the past," he says, "but to the future, looks true nobility, and finds its blazon in posterity." "I honour birth and ancestry," he says, "when they are regarded as the incentives to exertion, not the title deeds to sloth!"

To the modern reader, of course, all this is innocent enough—indeed too true to be good. But to the Tory critics of 1838, these lines and situations constituted an attempt to undermine the social orders of England.[7]

> He makes his peasant talk sad stuff [said the *Morning Post*] such as a manly peasant would never talk, about his natural equality, and so on, with persons of family. . . . The peasant (we are vexed to see Macready playing so foolish a character) thinks all true glory is to be sought in the future, not in the past, and therefore that ancestry signifies nothing.

The Times was even rougher in its condemnation:

> Anything is better than the republican clap traps which were flung in every here and there. We heard it hinted how wrong it was that there should be any aristocracy but that of merit—how contemptible it was to be proud of ancestors, and so on. Surely if hereditary dignity is to be attacked, the stage of Covent Garden Theatre need not be the platform whence such sentiments should be uttered. Yet uttered they were, and of course many vulgar bravoes followed them.

The conservatives of those days hated subversive ideas out of Paris as fiercely as their decendants do those from Moscow. They let no occasion pass, however slight, to reaffirm their allegiance to the standard credo, and to utter a barrage of abuse against the enemy.

Severe as these attacks were, they are nothing to what they might have been had the critics known that Bulwer, the notorious Liberal, was the author. For *The Lady* had been produced without Bulwer's name. Bulwer and Macready both believed that *La Valliere* had suffered from spite, and, desiring a fair hearing for *The Lady*, they had shrouded its authorship in mystery.

Macready was genuinely alarmed by the attacks—"the insidious imputation of disaffection," as he called them[8]—and doubted that the play would hold up. At the end of a week he sought to mitigate the menace by a curtain-speech. He denied that there were in the play any "political allusions that do not grow out of the piece, and are not necessarily conducive to the working of the story." He denied that the author, "whom he had the honour to know," would descend to claptrap, or that he himself would permit claptrap on his stage. He reminded his audience that the play had been passed by the censor; that even Shakespeare could be misconstrued by the wilful; that his own principle was "that art and literature have no politics."[9] The next morning's *Post* carried a new scather, accusing Macready of republicanism too, but on the whole the speech was well-timed and effective.

For one thing, it encouraged Bulwer to let his name appear. Macready wished not to expose Bulwer while the danger was too great, but by now it seemed the only sure way of lifting and

[7] Criticism of *The Lady of Lyons* is quoted from the following periodicals:
The Morning Post, Feb. 16, 22, 24, 1838.
The Times, Feb. 16, 24, 1838.

[8] *The Diaries of William Charles Macready*, ed. by Wm. Toynbee (London, 1912), entry for Feb. 18, 1838.

[9] *Ibid.*, entry for Feb. 21, 1838.

fixing public interest. So on Saturday, February 24, the news broke.

The Tories struck again. They had been taken in by a ruse and their rage was uncontrollable. The *Post* managed—with a great effort, one imagines—to maintain the dignity of a sneer:

> A thing so puerile in plot, so sickly in sentiment, so affected in phraseology, could not, we supposed, have been written by anyone who had received a regular literary education.

But the *Times* writer was caught off guard. He not merely screamed; he gibbered:

> We had no doubt it was an issue from the mint of which that gentleman [i.e., Bulwer] is a deputy master, for the scribblers of the French Boulevard-theatres are its real masters. No other school could or would produce such morbid sentimentality, such turbid sansculottism. We are not surprised to learn that the audience furnish the next day an ample harvest to the apothecaries; the whining and puling of the love scenes produce nausea, which is not a little augumented by the bile stirred up by the indignation at the politics of the mess.

The force of the attack was broken by its own extravagance. As Lady Blessington wrote to Bulwer: "The political attacks against *The Lady of Lyons can do no harm; everyone feels the motives.*" Macready was almost delighted by the *Times's* paragraph, declaring it "vulgar, virulent, and impotent from its display of malice—such an article as I would *wish* my enemy to write against me."[10] Shortly too the friendlier critics and the more intelligent even of Bulwer's enemies came forward to declare the political objections essentially beside the point. And during the third week Victoria the Queen attended the play and expressed great delight with it. Thus the howling of the wolves was silenced, and *The Lady of Lyons* rode on to assured and lasting triumph.

[10] Toynbee, *op. cit.*, I. 537.

V

By this time Bulwer had learned his lessons in propriety. The three plays which he wrote for Macready after 1838 were all great popular successes. The critics who disliked them based their attacks on literary and artistic grounds, rather than social or moral. At times in the next few years Bulwer nursed schemes which savor of rashness, but invariably his own good sense or the practical advice of Macready pulled him back from the brink. Once he wanted to prepare an arrangement of the murder of Clytemnestra, but Macready summarily dismissed it as not "possible to make . . . palatable to an English audience."[11] Other dangerous proposals which Macready scrapped or discouraged include: (1) a comedy centered on the career of a prime minister, satirizing Public Opinion and the Press;[12] (2) a refurbishment of the old Cromwell;[13] (3) a tragicomedy, or "mixed play," called *The Egotists,* a story of domestic entanglements and divorce.[14] Perhaps the most engaging scheme of all was for a satirical fantasy of Puss-in-Boots—"a sort of Beggars' Opera—full of allusions to the present day." The House of Commons, the Press, the Radicals, the Conservatives, the Corn Laws, homeopathy, hypnotism—a host of contemporary institutions and fads were to be jumbled together and mocked at in rhyming verse.[15] But this was mere passing fancy, obviously too dangerous for fulfillment.

[11] *Ibid.*, entry for Feb. 25, 1838.

[12] Matthews, *op. cit.*, letter no. LXV.

[13] *Ibid.*, letter no. LXXVII; Toynbee, *op. cit.*, entry for Jan. 6 and 8, 1841.

[14] Matthews, *op. cit.*, letters no. XC, LXII; Toynbee, *op. cit.*, entries for April 3, 5, 6, 9, 1843. Bulwer wrote four acts of *The Egotists.* They were posthumously printed in the Knebworth Edition of his works under the title of *Darnley.*

[15] Matthews, *op. cit.*, letter no. LXXVI.

The plays that he did write, had we space here to trace out the histories of their creation, might furnish us many instances of Bulwer's skill in suiting his materials to the scruples of his public. But a few notes must suffice. *Richelieu*, doubtless his most successful play, grew out of a French novel[16] which was morally far more contaminated than *La Vallière*, politically far more subversive than *The Lady of Lyons*. The main plot of the novel is a tragic story of sinful love and dark betrayal: Bulwer stripped it to a simple romance, put a happy ending to it, and stowed it in as a subplot. Richelieu was the villain of the *novel*, a hated and unscrupulous tyrant: Bulwer gentled him—a despot still, but a wise and benevolent one—and made him the hero. The heroes of the novel were political conspirators: Bulwer turned them into villains. The politics of this play, if the watchdogs were interested to discover them, were the very reverse of revolutionary. It is a masterpiece of adaption to the British conscience.

The Sea-Captain; or The Birthright, produced in October, 1839, eight months after *Richelieu*, is by far Bulwer's worst play, but it also succeeded. Hack-job as it is, yet it offered no moral affront and its avowed aim was the popular one of glorifying the English navy. Members of the first audience actually brought with them wreaths of flowers, "prepared garlands of the best manufacture," says a hostile critic, which they "hurled upon the stage like quoits."[17]

Bulwer's last play for Macready was *Money*, a comedy, produced in December, 1840. Here Bulwer essayed what was for him and for his time a new *genre* of comedy—the criticism of contemporary life. In an age so jealous of its social and moral status quo one would hardly expect the attempt to be tolerated, but *Money* enjoyed an unprecedented first run of eighty nights. Dexterity is the answer; Bulwer knew precisely how far he could go, and he went no further. In the theme of the play, that Englishmen are money-minded, he stuck to the obvious and avoided the controversial. In the application of his theme he took care to offend no individual and no social class. Still, however mild, *Money* is essentially critical, and its success drove into the ranks of the reactionaries a wedge for social drama. Neither Bulwer nor anyone else could follow up the advantage for many years to come; but he did demonstrate, when Henrik Ibsen was yet a boy in school, that social criticism, if handled circumspectly, could be put upon the stage. This, perhaps, was his greatest victory.

Bulwer as dramatist was both master and slave of the censorship restrictions of his time. No one will pretend that his achievement in the drama ranks with the great. But no fair observer would deny that the barriers set about him were insurmountable. He could not dig deep into problems of human passion, he could not cut wide swaths across social ills; for—all question of ability aside—those regions were closed to him. At the least invasion of those regions he was sharply warned off. Thereafter he minded the limits and strove for success in what little space was left him. That the Lord Chamberlain's office licensed his plays is a fact of minor significance. The greater fact is that his plays were shaped by moral and political pressure—the stuff of which censorship is made. I know of no other dramatist then working who shows the effect more clearly.

[16] M. Xavier-Baptiste Saintine, *Une Maitresse de Louis XIII*, second edition, 2 vols. (Paris, 1834).

[17] *The Spectator*, Nov. 8, 1839.

SPEECH REHABILITATION FOR VETERANS

M. LORRAINE AMOS

THOUSANDS of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines sacrificed their normal speech in World War II. The adjudication boards of the Veterans Administration, with their medical, legal, and rehibilitation personnel, have been exerting every possible effort to review the records and award monetary compensation to the veterans with service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities. In January 1947, the latest date for which accurate data are available, nearly 49,000 cases of World War II disabilities which might cause or result in speech disorders had been adjudicated. These disabilities were distributed as follows:

2,370 cases maxillo-facial disabilities
654 cases diseases of, injury to, or removal of larynx, and organic aphonia
20,107 cases traumatic encephalopathy and cerebral arteriosclerosis
25,672 cases hearing condition which may affect speech

Not all of the veterans within these classifications of disabilities have speech disorders but the percentage who do, added to: (a) the cases involving speech disorders which had not been adjudicated, (b) the veterans with functional disturbances of speech and rhythm occurring in the absence of specific structural causes, not included in the tabulation above, (c) the cases of veterans with non-service connected speech disorders, and (d) the speech disabilities among civilians present an unparalleled challenge to American speech pathologists and correctionists. In administering Federal laws which provide for rehabilitation training, the Veterans Administration joins hands with the speech pathologists and correctionists in the job of restoring to the ex-servicemen the opportunity to enjoy useful, well-adjusted lives in the society for which they fought.

Inasmuch as a speech disorder, per se, is not a compensable disability, the real magnitude of the speech correction problem among veterans cannot be accurately estimated. In the absence of objective data, it is prudent only to generalize with the probabilities: that a relatively high percentage of the cases of veterans with maxillo-facial disabilities, with disorders of the larynx or organic aphonia, and with hearing conditions of a nature which may affect speech, have, or are likely to develop, speech disorders; that a considerably smaller proportion of the cases of traumatic encephalopathy and cerebral arteriosclerosis, are likely to have speech impairments; and that the number of cases of purely functional speech disorders and non-service connected disorders and anomalies is sizable but cannot be estimated.

To aid in the solving of these speech correction problems, the Veterans Administration has developed two speech rehabilitation programs. The remainder of this article is a description of the rehabilitation programs in which speech correction is provided and following each description, is a résumé of the speech correction work in the program.

M. LORRAINE AMOS *is Hearing and Speech Rehabilitation Specialist, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C.*

In the Veterans Administration, speech correction services are provided under two distinct offices—the Department of Medicine and Surgery, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education. These offices, functioning under authority of separate Acts of Congress, have developed two programs for veterans with speech impairments—the medical program and the vocational rehabilitation program.

In the medical program, medical and surgical care, corrective therapy, physiotherapy, and occupational therapy including educational therapy and manual arts therapy, are provided. The services in this program are limited to treatment of disabilities incurred in, or aggravated by active military or naval service.

The purpose of vocational rehabilitation, as stated in the law which authorizes the program, is "to restore employability lost by virtue of a service-incurred disability." Under this program, a veteran with a disability for which compensation is payable, may receive a course of vocational rehabilitation if such a course is needed to restore the occupational status that the veteran might reasonably have been expected to attain had he not entered active service. This program may embrace specialized restorative training, which includes speech-correction training, to eliminate or minimize the handicap of all the veteran's disabilities, regardless of their nature or origin, that interfere with the restoration of his employability, as well as scholastic education, and on-the-job and institutional on-farm vocational training. A veteran pursuing vocational rehabilitation is eligible to receive any medical or dental service that is necessary to enable him to remain in, or to hasten his return to training.

Under the Department of Medicine and Surgery the speech therapy program is administered through two central office organizational units—specifically the Aural Rehabilitation and Speech Correction Division, Medical Rehabilitation Service, and the Neuropsychiatry Division, Professional Services. Treatment and therapy of patients with speech disorders of a physical origin are generally under the jurisdiction of the Audiology and Speech Correction Division while patients with disorders of a neurological or psychological nature are treated under direction of the Neuropsychiatry Division.

Both divisions utilize the facilities of colleges, universities, and other approved institutions specializing in speech correction work, through contracts negotiated by the Central Office Service Contracts Section, Procurement Division, Supply Service, Office of Construction, Supply, and Real Estate of Veterans Administration, for treatment of any one or any combination of the five categories of speech disorders mentioned on the contract as:

1. Disturbances of enunciation and articulation resulting from maxillo-facial injuries
2. Disorders of voice resulting from injuries to the larynx and adjacent structures
3. Disorders of language of an aphasic nature arising from cranial injuries
4. Loss of ability to understand and produce oral language resulting from loss of hearing
5. Functional disturbances of speech and rhythm occurring in the absence of specific structural causes.

Additional services are provided by the Department of Medicine and Surgery in centers, clinics, and hospitals of the Veterans Administration. A center has been established at the regional office in New York City for the treatment of veterans with hearing and speech impairments; mental hygiene clinics have been or are being estab-

lished in various field stations, including the regional offices in Boston, Chicago, Newark, New York, St. Louis, and Washington, D. C., for the treatment of veterans with speech disorders with no specific structural causes (psychogenic disorders); and two centers have been established for care and treatment of veterans with language disorders of an aphasic nature resulting from cranial injuries—one at Cushing General Hospital, Framingham, Massachusetts; and the other at Van Nuys General Hospital, Van Nuys, California.

The medical rehabilitation program of audiology for veterans with hearing and speech impairments at the New York Regional Office includes such diverse services as an ear, nose, and throat examination, the scientific selection of an electronic hearing aid, speech reading (lip reading), auditory training, speech and voice correction and retention therapy, and an orientation course. The orientation course consists of a series of lecture-discussions and individual consultations on the anatomy, physiology, and pathology of the hearing mechanism, the psychological aspects of hearing and speech impairments, psychotherapy, vocational problems associated with these disabilities, and special lectures on such topics as veterans' legislation, and special equipment available to veterans with hearing impairments.

Individual and group training is offered in the speech reading course in which fundamental skills are developed for optimum use of the visual, auditory, and kinesthetic cues in conversation. Short dramatic skits, written specifically for speech reading, add humor and real-life practice to this training and encourage maximum conversational efficiency.

Before the electronic hearing aid is selected the veteran is introduced to amplified sound over a high-fidelity group hearing aid. During this preselection period he is told quite frankly that an electronic hearing aid has major limitations and he is thoroughly prepared for the selection procedure. The auditory training staff assist in making the selection, and immediately follow up with a concentrated course in the care of the instrument and its use in the many difficult acoustic situations in which the veteran will wear it. Much emphasis is placed on the development of "discriminative" listening so that the many distracting sounds, which are amplified by the electronic hearing aid to the detriment of speech perception, are minimized and the problems of social and vocational adjustment, associated with wearing the instrument, are discussed.

The speech correction and voice training program is divided into two phases, the first of which deals with those veterans who show definite phonatory or articulatory change. A concentrated program of speech therapy is undertaken. This is preceded and followed by electrical transcriptions of the veteran's speech. The second phase of speech training concerns itself with speech and voice hygiene and an analysis of the types of speech and voice change which may occur in the future. This analysis is based on the type of hearing loss suffered by the veteran and is used in a program for the prevention of further deterioration of his speech and voice patterns.

In the mental hygiene clinics of the Veterans Administration, treatment for the functional disturbances of speech and rhythm occurring in the absence of specific structural causes (psychogenic

disorders) is provided for veterans. Also, when conditions warrant, treatment for aphasia is provided in the mental hygiene clinics.

The treatment for psychogenic speech disorders involves the following:

1. Medical, psychiatric, social and speech disorder case history
2. General physical examination
3. Analysis of the speech disorder
4. Psychiatric and psychological examination, including tests
5. Planning of a program of psychotherapy or psychiatric treatment
6. Administering psychotherapy or psychiatric treatment.

A speech pathologist, general physician, psychiatrist, psychologist, and psychiatric social worker colloborate in developing the case history of each patient. Every available source of background information significant in the interpretation of an emotional disorder is utilized in assembling a complete case history.

A physician makes a complete physical examination with particular reference to any physical conditions that might cause or contribute to an emotional disorder and, in collaboration with a clinical psychologist (speech pathologist), diagnoses any physical condition that directly affects the speech disorder.

A clinical psychologist, usually a speech pathologist, makes a psychological examination of each patient, administers standardized tests, and records his findings and recommendations for future reference in planning psychiatric treatment.

On the basis of the complete history and examination findings, the clinical psychologist (speech pathologist), the psychiatrist, and the psychiatric social worker jointly plan and carry out a medical program of psychotherapy. Regular individual conferences are scheduled, group therapy is applied, and home visits are made in the program of mental hygiene therapy. Treatment for veterans with aphasia in the mental hygiene clinics is similar to the treatment given in the centers for aphasia. It is discussed in the following paragraphs.

There are five steps in the medical program in the Veterans Administration centers for patients with aphasia:

1. Compiling and analyzing medical and social case history
2. Performance of a neurological examination
3. Administering a psychological examination including psychological tests
4. Planning a program for corrective retraining therapy
5. Administering retraining therapy.

The medical and social case histories of the patients in the centers are compiled by neurologists, neuropsychiatrists, and social workers. Each patient's pretraumatic history is carefully developed to provide significant information concerning such factors as educational background, personal habits, interests, occupations, and recreational activities. Both the patient and, when necessary, members of his family and friends are utilized as sources of case history material to be used later in planning an individual retraining therapy program for the veteran.

The neurological examinations are conducted by neurologists or neuropsychiatrists. Each patient is examined to obtain a diagnosis, as accurately as possible, of the nature and location of the lesion in the brain. Frequently, this examination is extensive and may involve a complete physical examination, certain surgical operations, Xrays, and electroencephalographic records. A clinical neurological diagnosis is made with special reference to cerebral defect.

Clinical psychologists (speech pathologists) make the psychological ex-

aminations to determine the intellectual and linguistic capacity of each patient and to evaluate other aspects of his personality. The examination, at the beginning of the treatment, includes administration and interpretation of results of a variety of standardized educational, intelligence, and performance tests.

On the basis of the medical and social case history, the neurological examination, and the psychological information, a neurologist or a neuropsychiatrist, together with a clinical psychologist (speech pathologist), diagnoses each patient's condition and, with a language retraining instructor (clinical speech correctionist), plans an individual program of corrective retraining therapy for each patient. The two-fold purpose of the program is to accomplish through retraining techniques, (1) maximum recovery of language abilities and (2) the adjustment of the patient —psychologically, socially, and economically—regardless of the skill in the various areas of language which can be restored. As the program progresses, each case remains under continuous study and both the selection of activities and the techniques are varied according to the responses of the patient.

The language retraining instructor, functioning under the general direction and supervision of the neurologist or neuropsychiatrist, together with the clinical psychologist (speech pathologist), provides a variety of formal individual and group instructional experiences. In addition to the formal learning experiences, a variety of informal social activities are arranged to assist the patient in maintaining or regaining psychological and social adjustment and to motivate and strengthen the desire for effective speech.

The program of vocational rehabilitation is administered under the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, through four Central Office Services—Registration and Research, Advisement and Guidance, Training Facilities, and Education and Training—and corresponding organizational units in branch, regional, and other Veterans Administration field offices. Each of these units has definite responsibilities in relation to the vocational rehabilitation of veterans with speech disorders.

Registration and Research establishes eligibility, maintains records relating to subsistence payments, and makes statistical studies.

Advisement and Guidance, through Veterans Administration personnel directly, and by contract with guidance centers in educational institutions, provides vocational advisement and assists veterans in selecting appropriate vocational objectives.

Training Facilities negotiates contracts and agreements with colleges, universities, and other institutions, establishments, and agencies to provide prescribed courses of training.

Education and Training concurs in the selection of an employment objective for the veteran, prescribes the training, selects the training facility to be used, supervises the training, maintains records of training, and when necessary assists in effecting placement into satisfactory employment.

Within Advisement and Guidance, and Education and Training, specific organizational units—Special Rehabilitation Advisement and Special Rehabilitation Procedures, respectively—are concerned with the cases of veterans with disabilities of such a nature that they affect the pursuit of courses of vocational rehabilitation. The personnel of these units individually specialize in

rehabilitation of veterans with particular types of disabilities. A vocational adviser has been designated in each Veterans Administration regional office and in each guidance center to specialize in the vocational advisement of veterans with impaired hearing or speech. Also, in each regional office, one or more training officers have been designated to specialize in the rehabilitation of veterans with these disabilities.

The course of vocational rehabilitation, which is designed to restore the veteran's employability, may consist solely of, specialized restorative training, designed to correct or remove the handicap of a specific disability or even the disability itself or a part of it. When a veteran, who is mentally and physically able to pursue, satisfactorily, speech correction training, has a handicap of a speech impairment which detrimentally affects satisfactory employability or the successful pursuit of vocational training, speech correction training, as a form of specialized restorative training, may be prescribed, provided there is good promise that such training will overcome or minimize the handicap of the veteran's speech impairment.

The kind and amount of speech correction training, as specialized restorative training, which a veteran receives is determined by, or with the advice of, the training officer specializing in speech and hearing and the speech pathologist under whom the veteran is entered into training.

Specialized restorative training may be prescribed, when appropriate, for a speech impairment resulting from any one, or any combination of the following causes:

1. Maxillo-facial injuries or anomalies
2. Disease of, injury to, or removal of the larynx or adjacent structures
3. Brain injuries
4. Hearing impairment
5. Emotional disorders (psychogenic).

The institution in which a veteran is to receive specialized restorative training is selected on the basis of its qualifications to provide the particular type or types of training needed by the veteran. The training facilities which are commonly selected to furnish speech correction training include speech clinics of colleges, universities, medical centers, hospitals, and public schools, speech clinics as adjuncts to guidance or mental hygiene clinics, private speech correction clinics or studios, and curative workshops.

Although the courses of vocational rehabilitation are provided by institutions or agencies, through contractual arrangements or agreements negotiated by Training Facilities Sections of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Divisions of the VA field offices, in-service training is provided for the training officers and vocational advisers, designated to specialize in hearing and speech disabilities. This training is designed to prepare the Veterans Administration personnel to render most helpful service directly to veterans and to cooperate most effectively with the training institutions.

The specific aim in the in-service training is to equip the training officers and vocational advisers with the following attributes:

1. An understanding of the physical aspects of hearing and speech which affect a program of vocational rehabilitation—including anatomy of the ear, nose and throat, rudimentary physiology of hearing and speech, measurements of hearing, and screening procedures.
2. Knowledge of specialized restorative training, medical rehabilitation, and the use of electronic hearing aids as each may affect the success of the vocational rehabilitation of veterans with hearing or speech impairments.
3. A basic understanding of the psychological and social effects of hearing and speech im-

pairments as they apply to training and supervision of veterans with such impairments.

4. Ability to assist in the selection of employment objectives which will be appropriate for any type of ear, nose, and throat conditions, and hearing or speech impairment, that may be encountered.
5. Broad knowledge of the curricula and the environmental conditions that are appropriate for each of the various types of ear, nose, and throat conditions, and hearing and speech impairments, such knowledge being essential for the proper selection of training facilities and the development of suitable programs of training.
6. Understanding of significant factors involved in locating, surveying, and evaluating training facilities for veterans with hearing and speech impairments in collaboration with training facilities personnel.
7. Comprehension of special techniques involved in the development of opportunities for employment in occupations for which veterans with hearing or speech impairments are in vocational rehabilitation training and placing those veterans into employment at the completion of training.

Through this in-service training, vocational rehabilitation and education personnel are prepared to cooperate most effectively with the institutions which furnish the specialized restorative training and to render most helpful and understanding service directly to veterans with hearing and speech impairments.

The personnel in the office of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education and in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, imbued with a high spirit of service, are an active part of the team of professional workers who are changing the prospects of mockery, ridicule, and frustration for veterans with speech disorders to opportunity for satisfying lives in a vocal society.

McGUFFEY'S ELOCUTIONARY TEACHINGS

GAIL JORDAN TOUSEY

ELOCUTION in America from the Revolutionary War through the nineteenth century was influenced by three main currents: the political, the nationalistic, and the moralistic. Political and religious oratory gave impetus to study of the fine art of speaking, of not only what to say, but how to say it. Books by John Walker, Thomas Sheridan, Lindley Murray, Samuel Kirkham, Hugh Blair, Richard Whately and other rhetoricians, elocutionists, and grammarians of the period stressed the relationship of punctuation, sentence formation, syntax, and definition to oral reading and speaking. Great emphasis came to be laid upon the rules and exercises in correct pronunciation and enunciation which were fostered by Noah Webster. Eloquent oral reading was a basic function of the educational process. As pointed out by Webster,[1] an ardent nationalist, knowledge of correct pronunciation and enunciation would aid in overcoming the diversity of dialects and in promoting greater national unity. Practice in the delivery of oratorical selections intended to develop elocutionary ability was considered vital under a democratic government.

I

In this period William Holmes McGuffey introduced his famous series of Eclectic Readers, the most widely used series of textbooks in the history of American education.[2] The popularity of the series was firmly established by the middle of the nineteenth century; it even lasted through the first quarter of the twentieth century. The series was composed originally of a primer, a speller, and four readers (1836 and 1837). With the development of the academies and high schools, a great need was felt for advanced readers, and to meet this need, the Fourth and Fifth Readers were added (1844 and 1857) to complete the series. That McGuffey occupies an important place in American education is attested by the thousands of persons still living, many of not too advanced years, who studied the famous Readers in their early school days.

McGuffey lived, taught and wrote many years before the present emphasis on rapid silent reading.[3] To him, reading meant one thing only—oral reading. Deeply impressed with the lack of both reading material and speech training exhibited by his Middle Western students, McGuffey undertook his series of Readers to fill this need.

Until the time of the publication of the McGuffey series, the textbooks commonly used were more concerned with mechanical rules, with emphasis on elocutionary display, than with such considerations as distinctness of articu-

GAIL JORDAN TOUSEY *is Instructor in Speech at Wayne University.*

[1] Noah Webster, *The American Spelling Book* (Boston, 1798), p. x.

[2] The American Book Company estimates the total sale of these Readers at 122,000,000 between 1836 and 1920.

[3] William Holmes McGuffey received his early education at the "Old Stone Academy," a seminary for boys at Darlington, Pennsylvania, and received his college degree from Washington College in Pennsylvania, September, 1826. He taught from 1825 to 1836 in Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; he was president of Cincinnati College from 1836 to 1839, and later became president of Ohio University. In 1845 he was appointed professor of Natural and Moral Philosophy in the University of Virginia, remaining there until his death in 1877. McGuffey was also an ordained Presbyterian minister.

lation and naturalness of delivery. The choice of material consisted of stories dealing with mysticism, fear of death, and predestination. McGuffey's aim was to eliminate the imitative and mechanical methods of presentation and to establish a natural form of reading by giving special attention to the problem of conveying the meaning of the printed page to the audience.

McGuffey was one of the first to understand the intellectual requirements of the people in the rapidly growing civilization of the old Northwest Territory. He recognized the necessity for emphasis on speech training for those immigrants who had difficulty in speaking clearly and without dialect the new English language. Because he knew and met the demand for a method of teaching reading to the beginner, his texts came to be regarded as supreme over all others of the period.[4] Practically every public school child between the ages of six and twelve throughout the Middle West and South was taught from the McGuffey series:

> Children were drilled from these books in pronunciation, enunciation, spelling and public speaking. for reading was the backbone of the school curriculum, and spelling bees and elocution contests took the place of music, the theater and competitive sports in the late Victorian Puritan home.[5]

The rhetorical principles and rules set forth in his Readers, according to Dr. Minnich, were partly formulated and used in his adult classes in college.[6] McGuffey's lectures to his college students were delivered extemporaneously, in language "exactly expressing his thoughts. . . . He taught with the simplicity of a child, with the precision of a mathematician, and with the authority of truth."[7] In keeping with his own principles of public speaking he destroyed his lecture notes so that his teaching would not become stereotyped and his delivery mechanical.

> . . . McGuffey was early interested in oratory and trained his students in public speech. The historians and valedictorians of the graduating classes always took elaborate lessons from Mr. McGuffey. When he was president of Ohio University, he gave speech training to the ministers who went out to preach directly from the University. This probably was his major contribution to Ohio University—a sort of theological seminary.[8]

McGuffey's great contribution to the field of general education is unquestioned; his contribution to speech education, although remembered by all who ever studied his Readers, has not been properly evaluated. This contribution may be summarized thus: (1) he recognized the need of specific instructions and training for teachers of reading; (2) he stressed clear enunciation as the first essential in teaching foreigners to speak English; throughout the books there is continued emphasis on correct pronunciation; (3) he rebelled against the mechanical and imitative method of teaching oral reading and oratory; he formulated and used rhetorical rules and principles in his own classes; (4) he reverted to the classical concept of teaching the child to speak and read properly "from the nursery"; and (5) he considered communication, the conveying of meaning to the audience, as the purpose of oral reading and oratory.

[4] Harvey C. Minnich, *William Holmes McGuffey and His Readers* (New York, 1936), pp. 59-83.

[5] *The Christian Science Monitor*, September 18, 1935, p. 3.

[6] This information was supplied during the writer's personal interview with Dr. Harvey C. Minnich at Miami University in December, 1945. Dr. Minnich is Dean Emeritus of the University, and Curator of the McGuffey Museum located on the Miami University campus.

[7] Henry H. Vail, *A History of the McGuffey Readers* (Cleveland, 1911), p. 28.

[8] Excerpt from a personal letter to the writer by Dr. Minnich, June 11, 1946.

II

The First and Second Readers appeared simultaneously, both following the pattern of reading combined with spelling.[9] The Second Reader (1857 edition) includes exercises on articulation, with the reminder that the "true elements of speech are the *sounds*, and not the *names*, of the letters. Hence, the first lessons in the Primary School, should be the separate, exact, and repeated enunciation of the sounds of the letters." McGuffey further contends that "it should be the aim of the teacher to secure, in the pupil, a true, accurate, and easy command of the elements of speech, and this cannot be done without frequent and careful practice."[10] In the Third Reader, all the rules for reading are practically reworded versions of those appearing in the Second.

The Fourth Reader gave an introduction to good literature, both classical and modern. It maintained McGuffey's prime rule of "Reading aloud with sense, clearness, and appreciation." In the preface of this book "the author discusses the mind of the child . . . , the value of the teacher's becoming a learner with the child . . . , [and] extends his instructions to the methods of teaching reading . . . [with] probable errors in pronunciation following each lesson."[11] This Reader includes the first division of elementary sounds of the English language into vocals, subvocals, and aspirates, a classification that stems from James Rush's *Philosophy of the Human Voice*.[12] All of the speech elements are to be learned by the student by first repeating the words and then the elements separately. Four pages are given to drills on difficult subvocal combinations such as *rst, mdst, dlst, rkst*, and others.[13]

Exercises in articulation include remedial drill on defectively articulated, omitted or incorrectly sounded words. In his examples of faulty articulation, McGuffey included metathesis, dissimilation, false analogy, haplology, assimilation, and archaic pronunciations, although these errors were merely classified in "correct" or "incorrect" columns, without specificially naming them.[14] Accent and inflection receive little discussion in this book.

Under the original plan, the Fourth Reader was the last one of the series. However, in 1844, the Fifth Reader was added for use in advanced classes.[15]

The Sixth Reader, the final one in the Eclectic Series, was first published in 1857. It was an advanced reader including mainly poetry and prose selections, some borrowed from the Fifth Reader, in addition to more detailed rules and explanations of elocution. In preparing the elocutionary rules and drills McGuffey made free use of the writings of "standard authors upon Elocution,"

[9] The First and Second Readers were published in 1836, the Third and Fourth in 1837, the Fifth in 1844, and the Sixth in 1857. The number of printings of original editions is unknown. As revisions were made, slight changes were also made in the titles. Editions that were available to the writer are cited.

[10] McGuffey, *New Second Eclectic Reader* (Cleveland and New York, 1857), p. 12.

[11] Vail, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

[12] Rush's divisions were tonics, subtonics, and atonics.

[13] *McGuffey's Fourth Eclectic Reader* (Cincinnati, 1879), pp. 11-18.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-22.

[15] This Reader was prepared by Alexander McGuffey, young brother of William Holmes. The first edition was published under the title of "Rhetorical Guide," with later editions including in the title "or Fifth Reader of the Eclectic series." Beginning with the 1857 edition, William Holmes' name replaces that of his brother, Alexander. It appears evident that the Fifth Reader's authorship should not have been attributed to Alexander; many of the selections and more difficult lessons of the first four Readers were incorporated in the Fifth Reader, as were the rules for correct articulation.

such as "Walker, McCulloch, Sheridan Knowles, Ewing, Pinnoch, William Scott, Bell, Graham, Mylins, S. S. Wood, James Rush" and many others.[16] The Sixth Reader like the Fifth, includes the derivation of formal rules from the suggestions and explanations of rhetoric as set forth in the lower readers, with more particular emphasis given to the finer points of elocution.

McGuffey contends that much preparation is necessary before the reading of a rhetorical exercise in order for the reader to "convey to the hearer fully and clearly, the ideas and feelings of the writer." Before reading aloud, it is assumed that the reader has familiarized himself with the content and has tried to ascertain the meaning.

III

The elements of elocution considered by McGuffey in the order of significance as indicated by their order in the Readers, are articulation, inflection, accent, emphasis, modulation, quantity and quality, poetic pause, movement, and gesture. The following discussion of these elements reflects McGuffey's arrangement.

Articulation

This, the first element of elocution, McGuffey considered of paramount significance. In an essay "On Elocution and Reading," he states that "the business of training our youth in elocution must be commenced in childhood," that "the first school is the nursery."[17] In order to avoid errors in articulation, he cautions against the omission or incorrect sounding of the unaccented vowels, and the blending of syllables which belong to different words. He then emphasizes the necessity for distinct utterance of the terminating consonants, giving examples of the correct and incorrect articulation of each type of possible error. McGuffey instructs the student to "remember that the chief beauty and excellence of reading consists in a clear and smooth articulation of the words and letters."[18]

Following the exercises in which the student is to observe the rules of articulation, is a warning to the teacher that "in correcting a fault, there is danger of erring in the opposite extreme." McGuffey believed that one could learn to articulate "too distinctly" and the student should guard against "drawling" and "pronouncing unimportant words with too much prominence," that such was "a childish fault and not always confined to the child."[19]

Inflection

The second element of elocution stressed in the Fifth Reader is inflection, defined as the "slides of the voice upward or downward," and being of two kinds: "the *rising* inflection and the *falling* inflection."[20]

Whereas inflection and accent were merely defined in the Fourth Reader, the Fifth and Sixth Readers devote from twelve to sixteen pages to this phase of elocution. Diacritical markings are used to signify each type, and in the original edition entire lines denoting complete word and sentence inflection are used.

[16] In the *Rhetorical Guide* (1844 edition) recognition is given to "Bell, Graham, Ewing, Pinnock, Scott, Wood, McCulloch, Enfield, Mylins, Sheridan Knowles, and others," omitting Rush. William Scott is the author of *Lessons on Elocution* (1820); John Walker of *Elements of Elocution* (1810), and *Walker's Speaker* (1806); S. S. Wood, publisher and author of the *New York Reader* series; and James Rush, author of *Philosophy of the Human Voice* (1827). The others mentioned have not been positively identified.

[17] *McGuffey's New Fifth Eclectic Reader* (Cincinnati, 1868), p. 145.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Although McGuffey's primary source for his rules is Walker, he digresses from the strictly mechanical and detailed instruction of his guide and gives only fundamental rules. He uses the circumflex, defining it as "a union of the rising and falling inflections." These he divides into two, "one called the *rising* circumflex, in which the voice slides down and then up; and the other, the *falling* circumflex in which the voice slides upward and then downward on the same vowel." He advocates the use of the circumflex chiefly to indicate the emphasis of irony, of contrast, or of hypothesis.

To illustrate the kind of instruction McGuffey gave: The falling inflection is to be used wherever the sense is complete, the exception to the rule being in a sentence which concludes "with a negative clause or with a contrast or comparison, the first member of which requires the falling inflection," in which case the rising inflection is necessary. For example:

> Truth is more wonderful than fiction.\
> I come to bury\ Caesar, not to praise/ him.

A series of words or members (if it does not conclude the sentence) called "a commencing series" requires the falling inflection at each word or member, with the last one requiring the rising inflection. Thus, we have the following:

> Wine,\ beauty,\ music,\ pomp,/ are poor expedients to heave off the load of an hour from the heir of eternity.

However, if these words are not emphasized, they all take the rising inflection, as:

> Wine,/ beauty,/ music,/ pomp,/ etc.

The falling inflection is essential when language demanding strong emphasis is used, except sometimes when a word which naturally requires a falling inflection becomes emphatic, in which case the rising inflection is then used. For example:

> O, ye Gods!\ ye Gods!\ must I endure all this?/
> It is useless to point out the beauties of nature to one who is blind./

Rising inflection is used "where a pause is rendered proper by the meaning, and the sense incomplete," as in this example:

> To endure slander and abuse with meekness/ requires no ordinary degree of self-command.\

However, where such a word becomes emphatic, it takes a falling inflection, as in the following:

> When we aim at a high standard, if we do not attain\ it, we shall secure a high degree of excellence.

Questions that can be answered by *yes* or *no* generally require the rising inflection; answers receive the falling inflection. For example:

> Has he arrived?/ Yes.\

And again where they are repeated emphatically, the reverse is true, as:

> *Has*\ he arrived? or, You ask, who would venture\ in such a cause!

Both the upward and downward inflection are used in sentences involving comparison or contrast, such as:

> In all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God; by honor,/ and dishonor,\ by evil/ report, and good\

Negative sentences, whether alone or connected with an affirmative clause, generally end with the rising inflection.

Where no word in a sentence receives inflection, it is read in a monotone. Such a tone is used to denote solemnity, sublimity, and intensity of emotion.

Accent

In his explanation of accent, McGuffey states that "custom is the only guide

of placing the accent on one syllable rather than another" and that the same word, differently accented, conveys a different meaning. He defines accent as the use of greater stress upon one syllable than upon another in the same word. He includes mention of secondary accent, although "the whole subject . . . properly belongs to dictionaries and spelling books."[21]

Emphasis

A third element of reading is emphasis, which the author of the Readers believes "constitutes the most important feature in reading and speaking and, properly applied gives life and character to language. Accent, inflection, and indeed, everything yields to emphasis."[22] The object of emphasis is to attract the attention of the listener to the word which best conveys the meaning of the sentence or phrase, accomplished by increasing the force of utterance, by changing inflection, or by change of tone. Emphasis is of two kinds: absolute and relative. When a word is emphasized simply to indicate the importance of the idea, absolute emphasis is used, but when words are emphasized to express comparison or contrast, relative emphasis is used.

Modulation

Pitch, compass, quantity, and quality are included in the lesson on modulation, the "variations of the voice." McGuffey says that there are few successive words pronounced exactly on the same key or with the same force, but that "at the same time, however, there is a certain PITCH or key, which seems, on the whole to prevail." This optimum pitch "varies in different individuals, and at different times in the same individual, being governed by the nature of the subject and the emotions of the speaker. . . . The range of the voice above and below this note is called its COMPASS."[23]

McGuffey suggests that the student choose the pitch which is most comfortable for his voice, at the same time choosing one that allows for maximum variation above and below the keynote. To avoid improper pitch, the reader should evade a monotone as it is "one of the greatest faults in elocution." Another fault of almost equal magnitude is that of varying the pitch and force without reference to the sense. The sing-song habit is a species of this fault, particularly noticeable in the reading of poetry. But if the reader or speaker is guided by the *sense*, and if he gives that *emphasis*, inflection, and expression required by the meaning, these faults will speedily disappear.[24]

Quantity and Quality

Quantity is synonymous with time, quality with expression. Both are dependent upon the nature of the material to be read. McGuffey remarks:

> We notice a difference between the soft, insinuating tones of persuasion; the full, strong voice of command and decision; the harsh, irregular, and sometimes grating explosion of the sounds of passion; the plaintive notes of sorrow and pity; and the equable and unimpassioned flow of words in argumentative style.[25]

Quantity may be classified as long, medium, or short. Quality, fullness or roundness of tone, is obtained "by dwelling on vocal sound, and indefinitely protracting it." It is McGuffey's contention that the proper use of subvocals and aspirates gives words their *shape*, while a "clear, full, and well-modulated utterance of the vocals gives to words their fullness."[26]

[21] *McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader* (Cincinnati, 1920), p. 26.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *McGuffey's Sixth Eclectic Reader* (Cincinnati, 1920), p. 49.

Poetic Pause

As selections of some of the greatest English poetry are used as illustrations in the entire series of readers, it is only natural that there be suggestions for the reading of poetry. This affords the constant use of the "poetic pause," the object of which is to promote melody. McGuffey suggests that at the end of each line of poetry a slight pause is generally proper, but that both this pause and the caesural pause (pause in the middle of lines) should not be so placed as to break the sense of the passage. "In reading verse, the inflections should be *nearly* the same as in reading prose. . . ."[27] Should the student doubt the proper use of an inflection, he is advised to speak the passage as if conversing with someone.

Movement and Gesture

The Sixth Reader includes a discussion of two additional principles involved in reading—movement and gesture. "Movement is the rapidity with which the voice moves in reading and speaking. It varies with the nature of the thought or sentiment to be expressed, and should be increased or diminished as good taste may determine."[28] The result of too rapid reading and speaking is a high key and an unnatural style of delivery. "The kinds of movement are *Slow*, *Moderate* and *Quick*," and are determined by the content of the "piece" to be read.

Gesture includes in its scope the speaker's manner pertaining to his attitude, his carriage, and the movement of his body in delivery. McGuffey's first direction to the speaker is "that he should *stand erect and firm* and in that posture which gives an expanded chest and full play to the organs of respiration and utterance." Secondly, the attitude, *i.e.*, stance or position, should "be such that it can be *shifted easily and gracefully*." Next follows the observance of "propriety and grace" in movement of the limbs. "The student who has any regard to grace or elegance, will of course avoid all the gross faults which are so common among public speakers, such as resting one foot upon a stool or bench, or throwing the body forward upon the support of the rostrum."

The use of the entire body is necessary for the good orator. The arms, however, according to McGuffey, are the chief reliance of the orator. But gestures with the arms, like movement of other parts of the body, should be free and made in a studied variety observing the grace of curved lines. "When a gesture is made with one arm only, the *eye* should be cast in the direction of that arm; not *at* it, but *over* it."

Of gesture and thought, the author points out that the gesture must be in harmony with the thought or sentiment, and such harmony constitutes propriety.

> The beauty and force of all gesture consist in its timely, judicious, and natural employment, when it can serve to illustrate the meaning or give emphasis to the force of an important passage. The usual fault of young speakers is too much action. To emphasize all parts alike is equivalent to no emphasis; and by employing forcible gestures on unimportant passages, we diminish our power to render other parts impressive.[29]

Reading meant to McGuffey not only oral reading; it meant, even more significantly, oral reading to an audience, whether the audience consisted of one or many. The student was to give attention not only to the thought of the material he was reading, but was to observe private conversations to ascertain the modulation, inflection, and emphasis of the speaking voice. Without applying the observations of the

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

speaking voice to oral reading, the voice would not express life or the thought being uttered. Foremost, he must obtain the author's thought and then *communicate* this thought, being "guided by the sense . . . [which gives] that *emphasis, inflection,* and *expression,* required by the meaning. . . ."

IV

McGuffey's primary contribution to speech education lay in his constantly stressing that *meaning* must be conveyed to the audience. He points out that effective reading is in proportion to the value or worth of the speaker, that the speaker's character is formed by reading —through perseverance, practice, and adherence to the literature and moral lessons included in the Readers. Oral reading should be for the purpose of communicating either the reader's or the author's thought, utilizing only those properties of voice and gesture as required for common speech.

THE FORUM

THE CHANGING OF THE GUARD

With this issue a new staff takes over the duties of editing THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. We therefore wish to announce some of our plans and policies.

The task of guiding THE QUARTERLY and maintaining its high standards for the next three years will not be easy. We succeed able men. Moreover, Departments of Speech throughout the country are now entering a period of expansion and transition. New specialties are developing, some are maturing, and some need to be saved from the infirmities of old age. Conceptions of what should be taught and the best ways to teach are being reformed. The demand for well-written, scholarly articles explaining our aims and methods will increase with the changing program.

To take care of what we believe will be a widening reader interest we are adding a department of Phonetics and we plan to include articles dealing with both experimental phonetics and linguistic phonetics. If certain technical difficulties can be overcome we plan to publish at a later date phonetic transcriptions as a regular feature.

We have added the words *and Television* to the Radio Department because we believe that in the next three years television will be of much greater significance in curricula for training in Speech and Drama.

We have expanded the department formerly devoted to Speech Education, and now named The Teaching of Speech, by designating editors for the levels of college and university teaching as well as the teaching of Speech in secondary schools and elementary schools.

We hope to enhance the value of the sections, New Books in Review and In the Periodicals, by increasing the number of reviews and by ranging out beyond the narrow limits of a few specialties.

There are other projects which we are now discussing and they will be announced in future issues.

The results of a recent survey of our membership indicate that for every one hundred members of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA sixty are teachers in colleges and universities, eight teach in teachers' colleges, four in junior colleges, fifteen in high schools, five in elementary schools, three in private preparatory schools, or in private teaching; one is a clinician in a speech clinic or in a hospital, and four have teaching connections other than these. Our mission is to keep all these members well informed about their profession.

For the past year the new editors have been questioning readers about their likes and dislikes. Many valuable suggestions have come to us concerning ways of improving the content and the format of the JOURNAL. We hope we can put into effect as many of these ideas

as our ingenuity and the limits of our budget will allow.

If one guiding policy for the acceptance of contributions is to be announced it is that high excellence of material, both in substance and in form, is our chief criterion. We hope to publish controversial articles and articles with which we as editors do not necessarily agree. We want the JOURNAL to be open to persons with differing beliefs at all levels of the teaching profession and among all the various teaching interests that now make up the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

To accomplish our objectives we need the energetic and wholehearted cooperation of our readers. We need good manuscripts, we want advice about good prospective writers, we welcome criticisms about articles published, and most of all we desire sound recommendations for improving the scholarly standing and the usefulness of the JOURNAL. The twenty-five members of the Editorial Board serve as your representatives. Please regard them as spokesmen for your ideas. With your help THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH can go on to a new high level of achievement.

H. F. H.

GO EAST OR GO CENTRAL IN APRIL!

TO THE EDITOR:

In behalf of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, may I use your columns to issue a cordial invitation to all who are interested in speech education to attend the Thirty-ninth Eastern Public Speaking Conference, to be held April 16 and 17, 1948, at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City?

At this Conference, as in the past, the leading aspects of speech will be discussed in general and sectional programs covering public speaking, debate, drama and theatre, interpretation, voice, speech pathology, and radio, as well as the broader problems of the place of speech in the educational system and the role of communication in society. The Conference plans to provide a treatment of speech and drama on the various levels, from the elementary to the graduate schools.

The Eastern Conference has always welcomed to its meetings all interested persons regardless of geographical location. No membership fee is required, and visitors are admitted to all sessions on paying the nominal Conference fee.

This year we especially welcome those who were unable to attend the SAA Convention at Salt Lake City. At our general sessions Past President Kramer, who presided at the recent national convention, will report on that session; and President Cortright will address the Conference on the present problems and opportunities in speech.

Besides these speakers, it is expected that important leaders outside the speech profession will address the Conference. Practical demonstrations of various types, tours to theatres, radio, and television studios, and exhibitions of books and mechanical devices useful in speech are being arranged.

Why not plan to meet with us in New York, April 16 and 17? To secure a program and further information, address

Russell H. Wagner,
President, Eastern Public Speaking Conference,
University of Virginia.

TO THE EDITOR:

The Central States Speech Association meets April 2 and 3, 1948, at the

Congress Hotel, Chicago. Perhaps this is your annual professional meeting!

Many of you regularly attend the CSSA meetings. I need not remind you of the worth-while discussions at Des Moines, Terre Haute, Oklahoma City, Iowa City, Columbia, and Minneapolis. Other teachers find it impossible to go to two meetings each year, and usually choose the larger one, the convention of the SAA. This spring eight hundred of your colleagues are expected at Chicago—a regional gathering with national proportions. For most of these eight hundred the CSSA will provide the "annual convention."

We of the Central States frequently enjoy the privilege of entertaining the national meeting. When we have this good fortune, our Association takes discussions of speech correction, drama, rhetoric, etc., to Oklahoma, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri. This year the parent association is appropriately honoring the West. In turn, CSSA moves to a readily accessible center, Chicago—often the site of profitable gatherings of our profession. And, repeating, for most mid-western teachers of speech, Chicago offers the one professional meeting of 1947-48.

The program will be in keeping with the event. Teachers in elementary and high schools, colleges and universities will find a full complement of meetings in teaching, activities, speech correction, drama, rhetoric, interpretation, phonetics, radio, and experimental work—more than twenty in all. Provocative speakers will address general sessions. These include Paul G. Hoffman, President of Studebaker Corporation, and Frank Sparks, President of Wabash College. Professor Frank Rarig, who retires this year from the University of Minnesota, speaks at the Association luncheon with the subject, "Our Speech our Our Inter-Personal Relations."

With these promises, the Executive and the Advisory Committees of the CSSA know that attendance from thirteen states will be high. We even hope that many of you from outside our area may attend your sectional meeting and ours too. You are cordially invited. Put April 2 and 3 on your calendar as dates for a professional meeting in Chicago—be it your second or only meeting for 1947-48.

John W. Black,
President, Central States Speech Association,
Kenyon College

OR GO SOUTH!

The annual meeting of the Southern Speech Association will be held from April 7 through April 10 at the Maxwell House, Nashville, Tennessee. The general theme of the convention is "Freedom through Speech." The opening sessions on Thursday, April 8, will introduce this subject and include discussions also of "Freedom through Religion" and "Freedom through the Press." The general session on Friday, April 9, will develop "Freedom through Speech" in the various aspects of the subject. Persons interested in attending this convention should write to the President of the Southern Speech Association, Professor Lester L. Hale, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.—*Ed.*

OUR NEW COVER

During the past year a number of correspondents have suggested that the cover of THE QUARTERLY needs to devote the next four issues to a kind of an experiment. Instead of deciding at once

on a new color for the cover, we have asked the printer to provide us with several samples, and we plan to publish the four issues of 1948 each in a different color. The cover for this issue has been recommended by the printer for its eye-appeal and for the way in which it makes the print stand out. At the end of the year we hope to solicit the membership of the ASSOCIATION for opinions about the most suitable cover to use in a more permanent way.—*H.F.H.*

GUIDE FOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

The following directions are summarized for the benefit of contributors to the QJS. Typescripts should be carefully checked against these requirements before being submitted for publication. Articles which do not conform may be returned by the editor for retyping.

1. The Typescript

a. All copy must be typewritten on standard size (8½ x 11 inches) paper, on one side of the sheet only, double spaced. Footnotes and indented quotations may be single spaced. Carbon copies are not acceptable.

b. Wide margins are necessary on all four sides. The left-hand margin should be at least one and one-half inches wide. Estimated number of words for the whole MS. should appear in the upper right-hand corner of the first page.

c. Contributors should make two copies of the typescript. They should enter on the retained carbon copy all corrections, additions, and special instructions that appear in the original.

d. Pages should be numbered in the upper right-hand corners.

e. When a sheet becomes hard to read because of excessive corrections and handwritten new matter, it should be retyped.

f. Old and dry typewriter ribbons cannot make clear-cut and legible copy.

g. Return postage should accompany the original manuscript.

2. Length of Articles and Reviews

a. The length of published articles varies in general from 1,000 to 5,000 words. The average length is 3,000 words. While longer articles may be acceptable, those under 3,000 words in length are more likely to be published. Writers should indicate appropriate main divisions of their articles by short sectional headings, typed in caps, or by the use of I, II, III, etc.

b. The editor of the department, New Books in Review, will specify the desired length of the review when he invites the contribution. The editor of the department, In the Periodicals, will similarly advise his assistants.

3. Proofreading

a. Contributors are urged to submit their manuscripts to competent critics before sending them to the editor. Before being submitted for publication, original copy should be carefully proofread by at least one person besides the author.

b. Galley proof and page proof are read against copy by both printer and editor, but proof cannot always be sent to the author. Diligent effort, therefore, should be made by the author to see that his original copy is free from error.

4. Titles and Signature

a. Titles, in full caps, should be brief and should relate clearly to the contents of the article. If the full title is not sufficiently brief, an equivalent descriptive statement of not more than 35 letters should be provided to serve as a running head for the following pages.

b. The author's name, in full caps, should be set two lines below the title.

c. The author's affiliation, school or college, or, if he is not so affiliated, his home city, and other biographical information will be included in a footnote supplied by the editor.

d. If the article has been read at a convention or otherwise publicly presented prior to submission to the QJS, that fact should be stated in the first footnote described in paragraph 4c.

e. In cases of collaboration the name of the principal writer should appear first. When direction or substantial assistance does not amount to collaboration, the writer may wish to include an acknowledgment in the first footnote.

f. When articles are condensations or by-products of directed research, they should be criticized by those responsible for the original studies.

g. For headings of book reviews or reviews of periodical articles, reviewers should follow what seems to be the normal form found in any issue of the QJS.

5. Punctuation

a. Use single quotation marks only, except that a quotation within a quotation should be enclosed in double quotes. (See the example in paragraph 5e.) Avoid the use of quotes to mark technical terms. Do not use them around the title of a book, journal, or article.

b. Quoted matter not exceeding five typewritten lines may be included in the text within single quotation marks.

c. Longer quotations, lists, etc., normally printed in smaller type than the type of the text, must be typewritten, single spaced, and indented. The colon precedes the part quoted. Do not use quotation marks for such inset matter.

d. Use square brackets [ ], not parentheses ( ), to enclose your own interpolations within a quotation or to enclose phonetic transcription.

e. A dash is typed as two hyphens, with no

blank space before or after. Example: 'This discovery—this "new world" to me —was "modern linguistic science."'

f. Indicate omissions in a quotation by ellipses, i.e., three dots. If the omission occurs after a complete sentence or ends at the end of a sentence, use both a period and the ellipses, i.e., four dots.

g. In a series of three or more use a comma before *and* and *or*.

h. For words discussed use italics, not quotes, as in the example directly above (5g).

6. ABBREVIATIONS

a. Conventional abbreviations from the Latin need not be italicized: i.e., viz., e.g., cf., vs., ibid., infra, supra, passim, [sic], etc. Capitalize the first letter of such abbreviations when they occur at the beginning of a footnote.

b. Use ibid. for the source cited in the immediately preceding footnote, with page number if not the same page. Do not use op. cit. or idem; use the author's surname or a catch title. So far as possible, specify the place when using supra and infra.

7. FOOTNOTES

a. Footnotes should be typed single spaced on a sheet or series of sheets following the text. They should not appear on the same sheet with the text. Superior figures precede each note. The first line of each footnote reference should be indented.

b. In the text the superior figure index for each footnote should follow the punctuation of the quotation or passage to which the note applies.

c. Footnotes are numbered consecutively from the beginning to the end of each article.

d. Use as few and as brief footnotes as is consonant with clarity and scholarly integrity.

8. REFERENCES

a. In the text references to THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, SPEECH MONOGRAPHS, and the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA will be printed in caps and small caps. In typing indicate by double underlining. In the footnotes the abbreviated forms QJS, SM, and SAA may be used. For these underlining is not needed.

b. Footnote references to books should indicate the place and date of publication in parentheses after the title; then the page number without the abbreviation p. or pp. If a volume number is necessary, use Arabic numerals; do not write Vol. unless the reference is to the entire volume, not to a specific page. With volume and page numbers use this form: 16.119-21.

c. Only if books are given in a bibliography or in some other context where availability to the reader is a consideration should the publisher's name be given.

d. In referring to periodicals, put the date of the cited volume in parentheses immediately after the volume number, thus: 20 (1941).71-3.

e. Names of books and journals should appear in italics (underlined in typing). Names of essays, poems, and articles, cited either in the text or in footnotes, should appear in ordinary roman type, not in italics, and not in quotation marks.

f. Avoid Roman numerals in citations; use Arabic numerals exclusively. To avoid confusion in denoting the numerals when typing use a small *i*, not a capital *I*.

g. Unless clarity demands it avoid needless repetition of numerals. Examples: 108-11 for 108-111, and 1945-8 for 1945-1948.

9. EXAMPLES

The usages recommended above for footnotes are illustrated by the following specimens:

[1] Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, abridged by D. C. Somervell (New York, 1947) 251-7.

[2] Allan Nevins, *Ordeal of the Union* (New York, 1947) 2 vols.

[3] W. P. Ker, *Epic and Romance* (London, 1897) 91-6.

[4] *The Tragedies of Sophocles*, trans. into English Prose by Sir Richard C. Jebb (Cambridge, 1925), 127-72.

[5] Ker, *Epic and Romance* 81.

[6] Bert Emsley, Talking Dictionaries, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH [OR QJS] 27 (1941) 275-80.

[7] Ibid. 278.

[8] M. Bautain, *The Art of Extempore Speaking* (New York, 1859) 149, 187, 211-12.

[9] *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 1446b, 8-11, trans. into English by E. S. Forster, in *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W. D. Ross (Oxford, 1924) vol. 11.

[10] Paul W. Merrill, The Principles of Poor Writing, *The Scientific Monthly* 64 (1947) 72-4.

[11] Samuel T. Williamson, How to Write Like a Social Scientist, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 4 October 1947, 17, 27-8; cf. *The New York Times*, 7 June 1942, Editorial, Chaucer and Mencken, Sec. 2, 7.2.

[12] H. W. Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (Oxford, 1926) articles: Wardour Street, Split Infinitive, prove, Elegant Variation.

10. CORRESPONDENCE

Contributions should be sent to H. F. Harding, Editor, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, The Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio.

Writers may also correspond directly with members of the Editorial Board:

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

Donald C. Bryant, Associate Editor
Washington University
St. Louis 5, Missouri

Frederick W. Haberman
University of Wisconsin
Madison 6, Wisconsin.

Ernest J. Wrage
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

DRAMA AND THE THEATRE
Hubert C. Heffner, Associate Editor
Stanford University
Stanford University, California

E. J. West
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

ORAL INTERPRETATION
Joseph F. Smith, Associate Editor
University of Hawaii
Honolulu 10, T. H.

Davis Edwards
University of Chicago
Chicago 37, Illinois

Aurora M. Quiros
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

RADIO AND TELEVISION
Waldo Abbot, Associate Editor
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Kenneth G. Bartlett
Syracuse University
Syracuse 10, New York

PHONETICS
John W. Black, Associate Editor
Kenyon College
Gambier, Ohio

Lee S. Hultzén
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

SPEECH CORRECTION AND HEARING
Paul Moore, Associate Editor
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

James Carrell
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

William G. Hardy
The Johns Hopkins Hospital
Baltimore 5, Maryland

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
Alan H. Monroe, Associate Editor
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Paul D. Bagwell
Michigan State College
East Lansing, Michigan

T. Earle Johnson
University of Alabama
University, Alabama

SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Evelyn Konigsberg, Associate Editor
Richmond Hill High School
Richmond Hill 18, New York

Carrie Rasmussen
Longfellow School
Madison, Wisconsin

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Dorathy Eckelmann, Associate Editor
Illinois State Normal University
Normal, Illinois

Merel R. Parks
12937 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW
Douglas Ehninger, Associate Editor
The Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

IN THE PERIODICALS
Giraud Chester, Associate Editor
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

NEWS AND NOTES
Robert F. Ray, Associate Editor
1 Elk Street
Albany 1, New York

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

DOUGLAS EHNINGER, *Editor*

WORDS ALL EARS TAKE CAPTIVE

The Psychology of Rumor. By GORDON W. ALLPORT and LEO POSTMAN. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1947; pp. xiv+247. $2.60.

According to the preface, *The Psychology of Rumor* is a "basic textbook" which gathers together "all the relevant information that concerns this important topic." It might appear somewhat unlikely that such an ambitious project could be accomplished within the limits of one 225-page text, or perhaps even in several such volumes. *The Psychology of Rumor* is, however, a well-written study which is likely to be read with interest both by the layman and by specialists. The authors have succeeded in compressing a good deal of pertinent information, much of it the result of their own original research, and their analysis contributes considerable insight into the mechanism and social significance of rumor.

For review purposes the book may be divided into three major sections. The first of these sections (Chapters I, II, and III) is devoted to definitions of terms and of the "basic law of rumor." The second (Chapters IV through VIII) gives a suggested methodology for the study and analysis of rumor, and presents the results of experimentation undertaken by the authors. In addition to this discussion of methodology, fundamental generalizations are made from time to time and exemplified by reference to the experimental data which are presented. The third division (Chapter IX) is an analysis of the importance of rumor and its functioning in the societal structure.

In addition to these three major divisions which appear to encompass most of the announced aims of the authors, the text contains a chapter on the "Analysis of Rumor" (Chapter X). This attempts to provide a practical guide for the analysis of rumor and includes seven case studies used as illustrations of suggested analytical methods.

A series of rumors which have not been subjected to analysis are also included to serve as problems for the student. A helpful, but rather limited and specific bibliography without notations is appended. It would be of greater value had it not been restricted so severely to references bearing directly upon the subject. It appears to contain no titles other than those in the text. An appendix attempts to establish "standards for agencies working on the prevention and control of wartime rumor."

Rumor is defined for purposes of the text as "a specific (or topical) proposition for belief, passed along from person to person, usually by word of mouth, without secure standards of evidence being present." Careful distinction is made between rumor, which is always marked by lack of evidential standards, and "news," which the authors argue is at least partially provided with adequate evidential standards by the use of by-lines and by editorial responsibility.

Some readers may feel that the authors have chosen to be notably kind to newspaper publishers and, indeed, the writers themselves later qualify their relatively non-critical evaluation of "news" when they briefly discuss "The Press and Rumor."

Rumors circulate, the authors state, only when two basic conditions occur. The theme of the rumor must have "importance" to the rumormonger, and the "true facts must be shrouded in some kind of ambiguity." The importance of these conditions is emphasized by the authors when they utilize them to develop a "basic law of rumor." Inasmuch as importance to the speaker and ambiguity appear to be linked in a "roughly quantitative manner," it is suggested that a formula for the "intensity" of rumor might read:

$$R \text{---} i \times a$$

That is, that the amount of rumor in circulation varies directly with the importance of the subject of the rumors to large publics and the lack of general information concerning the subject of the rumor.

It should be noted that where the authors present a formula for derivation of the "intensity" of rumor they apparently mean intensity in terms of frequency. Considerable dependability is claimed for this rule, and it is qualified only by the statement that is it likely to fail in totalitarian states which invoke strict censorship, or in extremely heterogeneous societies where there is little effective communication among component groups. In addition, the reader is warned that the operation of the rule

may be affected if a significant part of a public exposed to rumor is aware of rumor-mechanisms and is therefore on its guard against them.

The second section of *The Psychology of Rumor* is devoted to the description of a series of experiments dealing with the mechanisms of rumor and to reporting the data elicited by them. Selected subjects were confronted by standard stimulus situations with which their later reproduction of these situations could be compared. Changes which occurred in successive reports were then noted. It was found that the most valuable variation of this experiment (from the viewpoint of the text) was to have reproductions of the standard stimulus situation transmitted through the oral report of a number of successive individuals, since by the use of this "serial reproduction" the "social factor" in rumor transmission could be studied. The authors candidly admit that laboratory control over the rumor process can be achieved only at the expense of over-simplification and with the loss of the "deep-lying motivation that normally sustains rumor spreading. . . ." Moreover, they admit that the subjects of the experiments, knowing that their accuracy as reporters was at stake, were apt to bias their reporting in favor of a strict accuracy which they would not attempt to achieve outside of the laboratory. Nevertheless, they point out that the factors distinguishing the laboratory over-simplification of the rumor process tend to enhance the accuracy of the reproduction of the original stimulus situation and "to yield far less distortion and projection than in real-life rumoring." They therefore conclude that such experimentation "succeeds fairly well in eliciting all the basic phenomena of rumor spreading."

The experiments demonstrated that "as rumor travels, it tends to grow shorter, more concise, more easily grasped and told." The number of details contained in the terminal reports always decreased from an original twenty-odd to an average of five. In addition the rate of decrease in the number of details included in the reports declined most rapidly in the first few reports and later stabilized to a level below which there was no decline in the number of details reported. This shortening tendency was termed "leveling." It was found that "(1) a short concise statement is likely to be faithfully reproduced, (2) that when the report has become brief, the subject has very little detail to select from and the possibilities of further distortion grow fewer, (3) that the assignment becomes so easy that a virtually rote memory serves to hold the material in mind."

It was also found that rumors tend to become "sharpened." That is, that selected perception, retention, and reporting of a limited number of details from the entire stimulus situation occurs. This tendency, the authors state, "is the reciprocal phenomenon of leveling; the one can never exist without the other." It would appear that the various subjects seize upon any portion of the reports made to them which seem to be of especial significance and that it is these details which they pass on to their successors.

Finally, it was found that rumors are distorted by the process of "assimilation." This term refers to the "powerful attractive force exerted upon rumor by the intellectual and emotive context existing in the listener's mind."

The third major division of *The Psychology of Rumor* deals with rumor in society. In many ways this section of the book (Chapter IX) presents some of the most valuable material considered. The authors present a brief historical sketch of the importance placed upon rumor by other peoples, particularly by the Romans, and then introduce a discussion of rumor and legend. They point out that legends "may be regarded as solidified rumor" and consider the special importance of these legends, or "myths" as "those dealing with primal forces, cosmology, or religion." The processes of leveling, sharpening, and assimilation are shown to be of significance in the formulation of myths. The authors query, from the standpoint of the poetic soul: "Is it not more important for a legend to symbolize a spiritual intention than for a prosaic critic to isolate the pure historical truth from the gradual assimilation and sharpening of this truth?"

Possibly most of us are "poetic souls," and possibly man does attempt to explain his environment and to state his goals in life, at least in part through use of the mechanisms with which *The Psychology of Rumor* deals.

MARBURY B. OGLE, JR.,
Purdue University

TWELVE GOOD MEN AND TRUE

For the Defense: Thomas Erskine. By LLOYD PAUL STRYKER. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1947; pp. xi+624. $5.00.

In the face of the great quantitative emphasis of classical rhetoric upon forensic oratory, it is a little odd that the 20th-century revival of classical rhetorical study, which is practically coeval with the life of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, has produced proportionately little study of the speeches of the law courts. No doubt

the reason is that the "nobler" occupations of the senate and the pulpit have been of more consequence generally to the growth of Anglo-Saxon freedom and American democracy, and hence of more interest to students of public address. As this review is being written, however, there appear suggestive signs from Washington and elsewhere that in the near future even American democracy may have to look to the exertions of such liberal, courageous lawyers as Thomas Erskine for protection, so far as protection is possible, from the hysteria of the red-purge and the witch-hunt.

It was in the courts and before English juries that the great Whig barrister did battle for trial-by-jury and English constitutional freedom against the despotism of George III and the reign of terror under Pitt. From his maiden case, the defense of Baillie of Greenwich Hospital in 1778, through the trials of Admiral Keppel, Lord George Gordon, William Shipley, Tom Paine, Horne Tooke, and several others, against the best that arbitrary power could do, Erskine won many more cases than he lost. It is in such situations that the forensic speaker addresses the larger public of the nation and approaches the functions of the deliberative.

In the history of public address, the book now under consideration is important in its selection of raw material in convenient compass for an introduction to the study of Erskine as a speaker. The significant portion of it (about half) tells the stories of Erskine's "public" cases: it describes their circumstances, details their backgrounds, and summarizes and excerpts the speeches which Erskine made. There is no account of his hundreds of private cases and almost no reference to them; and his personal and social life are touched in perhaps a score of scattered paragraphs.

Mr. Stryker presents very little rhetorical analysis or criticism. His comments, enthusiastic though rudimentary, amount to repeated assertions of Erskine's honesty, his patriotism, his respect for law, his devotion to English liberty, his loyal Whiggism, his courage, the "magic" of his voice, and his instinctive knowledge of the "human heart" and how to appeal to it. There are many interspersed quotations to much the same effect from Erskine's contemporaries. To indicate this deficiency, however, is not to tax Mr. Stryker with it, for it was not his purpose to study Erskine's rhetorical methods. He wished to portray "the most enlightened liberal of his times, 1750-1823," and that he did.

Valuable as much of his book is, especially for the reader hazy in 18th-century history, it is lamentably lacking in unity and basic coherence. To page 46, when Erskine was 28 years old, it is a routine but sketchy biography. For the next 375 pages it is a vivid, able, and more or less consecutive account of his major "liberal" cases, some of his political friendships and misadventures, and his short tenure of the Lord Chancellorship. In the last 150 pages, Erskine is incidentally present as a member of the House of Lords, but one seems to be reading a different book—about Queen Caroline and Lord Brougham—not uninteresting but certainly not the book the reader thought he had been reading, except for long and dimly relevant excursions, for the first 400 pages.

When Mr. Stryker is content to write straightforward exposition, the fastidious reader will not be disturbed by the style. His subject, however, inevitably stimulates the author to an eloquence which is too freely spotted with purple and clichés. There is also an excessive amount of chronological backing and jumping, and the coherence derived from mere juxtaposition is, alas, not good enough. The material and subject are such, however, that what is a useful book in 600 pages might have been a truly good one in 350.

DONALD C. BRYANT,
Washington University

"GIVE SORROW WORDS"

The Language of Tragedy. By MOODY E. PRIOR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947; pp. viii+411. $5.00.

It is the task of our generation to seek the unity in verse tragedy—to rediscover the function of poetry in drama. Both the nineteenth century and the age of realism have made that task difficult: the nineteenth century by praising the poetry as purple passages or as adornment while throwing contempt on the drama, and the realists by exalting the other aspects of stage performance while excluding any exaltation by language. Today, when we want a drama as powerful in all its aspects as that of the Greeks and the Elizabethans was powerful, it becomes especially important to understand how intimately the language of tragedy can be related to the play as a whole.

Professor Prior, limiting himself to the study of imagery in poetic drama, examines four different periods—the Elizabethan, the Restoration, the Nineteenth Century, and then the Twentieth—to describe the nature of the imagery and how it reinforces the plot, the characterization, or the theme of a play. He not

only illuminates the plays of each period, but throws a great deal of light on the problem of writing plays today with some kind of richness of language. He shows not only that in the best achievement of the past the imagery is an integral part of the whole play but that, where the imagery is not unified and does not reinforce the most important elements of plot and theme, there are usually other serious flaws in the writing.

The chapter on Elizabethan plays adds little new to the brilliant studies of Shakespearean imagery already made by Wilson Knight, Caroline Spurgeon, and others, but it re-examines the imagery of *Romeo and Juliet* and of *King Lear* in a much saner way, and shows how the imagery is related to the wellsprings of dramatic action. The analyses of imagery in *Spanish Tragedy*, *Tamburlaine*, *Duchess of Malfi*, and other tragedies of the time will be indispensable to the student of Elizabethan drama. The book makes little attempt to treat the verbal images in relation to the visual images or the music and sounds of the Elizabethan stage, and our larger understanding of the unity of a Shakespearean play must include the dumb shows, the symbolic properties, the pageants, the bells, drums, and trumpets, as well as the words.

In studying the serious Restoration plays, Professor Prior puts his literary background to good use in comparing the techniques of presenting passion and conflict in the drama with the techniques of argument, analysis, and persuasion in non-dramatic poetry. He makes a telling analysis of Tate's revision of *King Lear* to show the conflict of two ideals of imagery, and traces the damaging effect on *Venice Preserved* of imagery designed to display the pathetic passions. *All for Love* receives high praise for its integration of image and action.

The failures of Byron, Shelley, Browning, and Tennyson are shown to be not only failures in play construction but failures to make the images of their plays coalesce or progress with the motifs of character and action. It was providential that the realistic impulse put an end to the whole tradition of English verse drama and wiped the slate clean for our age.

Yet the extent to which Anderson leans on the Elizabethans and to which Auden and Eliot, in their own ways, repeat the mistakes of the nineteenth century in treating poetry as enhancement for the isolated moments, shows that our age is far from solving the problems. The presence of poetry in the realism of Eliot's *Family Reunion* produces strain and disharmony, yet the expressionistic methods of Auden and Spender are no better calculated to unify either the poetic or the dramatic elements. Professor Prior is severe on the actual poetic plays of our age and discouraged by the lack of any tradition such as the Elizabethans had, but sure of the importance of poetic imagery in serious drama.

Although the book does not consider the play of poetic prose, the radio play, or (except for Eliot) the modern religious drama—forms that give promise of more important enrichment in language than the formal poetic plays—yet it has a great deal to say to any playwright interested in language. For the drama student it brings new insight into the problem of poetic drama by examining not isolated plays, but the changing approaches to the problem over the last four hundred years.

GEORGE R. KERNODLE,
State University of Iowa

"THEY ARE FED BY THEIR HEARTS" —HENRY WARD BEECHER

The Heart of the Yale Lectures. By BATSELL BARRETT BAXTER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. pp. xiii+332. $2.50.

Students of the theory of public address are aware of the contribution that preachers have made to their subject. That preachers are more interested in public speaking than are other professional men is probably due to the fact that they have to speak so often and as effectively as they can. Campbell, Blair and Whately were giants in our field. Beecher and Brooks should be studied as seriously as they are.

Baxter has not let the number of lecturers obscure the relatively few important ones. There is more in the book from Beecher than from the others. This is as it should be. But Brooks, Simpson, Dale, and Broadus are represented in a due proportion.

The difficulties in the way of a volume such as this are almost insurmountable. There is such a mass of materials. Not the least of Baxter's contributions is his organization of the quotations. His plan is to have one section on the preacher, one on the sermon and one on the congregation.

There is also a chapter on conclusions and evaluations. Baxter shows himself to be at home in ancient and modern rhetorical criticism. He uses Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Whately, Phillips, Winans, Brigance, Immel, and Monroe as his yardsticks.

To me it is interesting that this book, which was undoubtedly a Ph.D. thesis in origin, was suggested by one of our great colleagues, Ray

Kesslar Immel. And Dr. Immel, in turn, was led to the Yale Lectures, as I was, by Thomas C. Trueblood, who knew Henry Ward Beecher. Professor Trueblood gave a graduate course in readings in the field of public speaking. Among the books we read were those of Henry Ward Beecher and Phillips Brooks.

Every teacher of speech should have this book on his own reference shelf and every student of speech should have it available on the reference shelf of his library. It is a splendid contribution to the field of rhetorical theory.

LIONEL CROCKER,
Denison University

CURTAIN GOING UP

Working Up a Part: A Manual for the Beginning Actor. By H. D. ALBRIGHT. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917; pp. x+224. $2.50.

As suggested by the title, this book is an approach to the many problems of working up a part, and is offered as a guide for two groups of beginners in the field of acting. First, it is intended to serve as a textbook for beginning college classes in acting; and second, it is designed to serve as a handbook for those actors in school or community theatres who have had a limited experience in acting, but who have had no formal training in acting technique.

The first 104 pages constitute the author's theory of approach and practical suggestions for developing the various techniques of working up a part.

In Chapter I—the Introduction—the author states clearly and specifically his basic philosophy underlying the method to be followed in rehearsal and performance. Chapter II deals with analyzing the part, including a study of the nature of the play, and the relationship of a particular part to the play as a whole. Chapter III takes up rehearsing the part and deals with the important problems involved in developing effective bodily action. Chapter IV deals with the various problems involved in rehearsing for naturalness of speech, expressive meaning, and vividness of oral presentation. Chapter V takes up the specific problems of voice production, special vocal considerations, articulation, and pronunciation. Chapter VI presents a plan for synthesizing solutions of the problems already discussed into the over-all pattern of a definite characterization. Here special attention is given to the important problem of motivation. Chapter VII deals with the playing of a part, insuring clarity, interest, and making a final check upon the integrative elements which make for a good presentation.

In order to give unity, coherence, and general effectiveness to the total procedure, there are, at the ends of chapters II, III, IV, V, and VI, check-lists to be used by the student in order to help him determine the degree to which he has effectively applied the principles outlined for him in various chapters. Following each check-list is a series of exercises which will guide him in the further development of his specific objective.

Pages 105 to 173 are devoted to the appendices. The first is a primer of stage directing; the second deals with theatre esthetics; the third contains suggestions for study and memorization; the fourth is a glossary and bibliography; and the fifth presents a series of drill selections. In keeping with the statement in the beginning of the preface, these are all designed for use at the beginning-actor level.

Throughout the book, the author has maintained a high degree of consistency in his approach to the various problems presented. He has used a strictly academic style of presentation. Some, perhaps, will maintain that his method is too formal and, at times, too academic for the beginning actor. However, it must be borne in mind that the purpose is to present a manual of procedure and not a popular treatise of problems involved. The reader is impressed by the fact that the author has, as he acknowledges in the last paragraph of the preface, been greatly influenced by his teachers and colleagues at Cornell University. It is, in fact, a systematized presentation of what could well be called the "Cornell System," which is, in a sense, proof of its value. The academic approach and the formality of this book are in strict contrast to the informality and the conversational method used by Stanislavsky in his book, *An Actor Prepares.*

Teachers of acting on the college level and directors of community theatres will be definitely aided in the solution of their many problems by following the helpful suggestions given in *Working Up a Part.* It can be effectively used either as a text or as a reference handbook.

LEE NORVELLE,
Indiana University

THE NEWS TILL THIS MOMENT

News on the Air. By PAUL W. WHITE. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1947; pp. x+420. $2.50.

Paul White designed this volume for the student planning a career in radio journalism as

well as for full-fledged members of the craft, and he seems to have accomplished his dual objective with more than passing skill, for here is one of the most readable texts yet offered on any phase of radio. Both groups of readers will enjoy his brisk, breezy style, which, together with the adult level at which he directs his observations and the absence of usual textbook-ish "talking-down-to-the-student," permits him to attain his divers objectives. While at first the material may seem carelessly set out and the paragraphs lightly titled, careful perusal will serve to indicate that the text is not nearly as unstudied as it is designed to appear, but basically well-planned and thoroughly teachable.

That Mr. White is able to handle his subject in an authoritative manner will occasion no surprise among those familiar with his career as news chief for the Columbia Broadcasting System from 1933 until May of 1946. White arrived at CBS when there were so few actual news programs that most of the news tips were obtained from the newspapers and verified by telephone. He remained until he had developed what probably still is the best of the radio network news staffs. At one time or another his staff has consisted of such men as: H. V. Kaltenborn, Edward R. Murrow, William L. Shirer, Elmer Davis, Cecil Brown, Quincy Howe, John Daly, and Charles Collingwood.

From his background of experience White proceeds to demonstrate the difference in writing news for the ear as opposed to writing for the eye. His first chapter is an obituary for the five "W's" and the "H." In deft fashion he topples the inverted pyramid as he points out that the long, involved, and cumbersome style that is traditional in newspapers has no place in radio.

White, however, does not limit his work to a mere discussion of news-writing principles; he surveys the entire field. He presents a running commentary on the early press-radio wars, as well as a discussion of the preparation of news broadcasts, their delivery, questions of policy, news judgment, taste, and legal restrictions. The chapter on propaganda and its relation to the news is especially worth-while.

White also discusses the scope permitted to commentators, the influence of radio surveys, and specialized news broadcasts for women, children, sports fans, farmers, as well as documentary broadcasts; he even manages to find space for a few thoughts on job opportunities and a quick preview of television and facsimile as it relates to news broadcasting. All of these items are effectively illustrated with extensive samples of leased-wire material and firsthand examples from White's own experience.

In only two areas is one left with a feeling of incompleteness or inadequacy. The first is in the somewhat overzealous manner in which White assumes the superiority of the presentation of news over the air as opposed to the presentation by newspapers; and the second, and infinitely more important, is the somewhat naïve faith displayed by White in defending the news commentator as not being subjected to sponsor influence. White points out that he has never known a case in which the sponsor has attempted to dictate a point of view to a news commentator. He seems to have missed the point brought out by men such as Jack Gould of the *New York Times* that when the sponsor can choose the commentator in the first place, it is not necessary to dictate to him later.

These criticisms notwithstanding, here is the best full-length book on newscasting available today and one that should be on every radio student's bookshelf.

JOHN B. ROBERTS
Temple University

THE KNIFE AND FORK CIRCUIT

How to Run a Meeting. By EDWARD J. HEGARTY. New York: Whittlesey House, 1947; pp. 222+xii. $2.50.

Practical Parliamentary Procedure. By ROSE MARIE CRUZAN. Bloomington, Illinois: McKnight and McKnight, 1947; pp. 202. $2.50.

Some years ago an astonished European refugee declared that "Whenever three or four Americans get together they form a club and hire a speaker!" Whatever sociological implications lie behind this observation, it does suggest the practical problem confronting thousands of brothers and sisters who must arrange weekly and monthly meetings at the regular stops on the knife and fork circuit. It's a rare town that does not boast a complete roster of service clubs, women's clubs, fraternal lodges, and church, labor, professional, and educational organizations. But a fair and frank investigation of most of them would reveal that their meetings are rather indifferently planned and casually run.

How to Run a Meeting is written for the committee, the president, the secretary, or the program chairman who would like to do a better job. It is good advice. Mr. Hegarty, manager of sales training for Westinghouse, has by his

own admission, "been around." For him his publishers claim thirty years as a meeting planner, guest speaker, and organizational factotum. As one who has spent more than a third as many years in the same kind of extracurricular activity, this reviewer can report that Mr. Hegarty has overlooked but few points, and he has included many practical suggestions which will help even the most skilled chairmen. It has been said that sitting in meetings is some of the hardest work we do, yet we commonly pay dues for the privilege. The average club member is more apt to get his money's worth in well-planned, smooth-running meetings if he elects a chairman who will promise to read this book.

Out of his experience as a meeting planner, the author has written twenty-one chapters dealing with such topics as "How to Get Speakers," "Arranging the Meeting Room," "Handling the Guest Speaker," "Keeping the Meeting Moving," "Handling Disturbances," and "How to Stage a Discussion Session." Another eighteen chapters (they are all short) come from the author's experiences as a guest speaker. "How to Organize Your Presentation," "Deal the Audience a Hand," "Using Charts to Present Your Story," "What to Do About Notes," "Using a Film in Your Meeting," and "Don't Try to Be Too Funny," are titles which suggest his coverage. If some of these captions seem racy they are a fair reflection of the style of the whole book. Mr. Hegarty writes breezily, anecdotally, and sometimes repetitiously, but he also writes simply and clearly. Most important, he stays with his subject: there is scarcely a page in the book without at least two or three concrete and sensible suggestions on some phase of running a good meeting. At the end of each chapter is a succinct summary of its main points. The volume is reasonably attractive in format and, in view of current book publishing costs, it seems not overpriced.

Where can the speech teacher use the book? It seems unlikely as a college text (though it might serve well for a short training course for community club chairmen), but it should certainly be a useful reference volume in any school or public library. Along with related books on parliamentary procedure, group organization, and discussion leadership, *How to Run a Meeting* ought to be called to the attention of students in speech.

Another phase of organization meetings, the business session, is covered in Miss Cruzan's *Practical Parliamentary Procedure*. It is comprehensive, offering advice on everything parliamentary from organizing a club, writing its constitution and bylaws, and conducting its affairs, to adjourning the final meeting. In general it is based upon the rules codified by Robert; there is no quarrel with the author on technical points. Her coverage of the subject should be an adequate guide for the club chairman. In addition to commending her book to everyday organizations, however, the author also submits that it is "designed especially" for schools and colleges. On this ground one must report that there are better textbooks, even in the same high price range. Few concrete and practical parliamentary problems are included for practice; the summary tables of motions, though complete, are not as easy to use as they might be; the author's style lacks conciseness and color, and the average college student might well feel that she is "writing down" to him. (In fairness, however, this latter criticism may not be valid for younger high school students.) "An afterthought chapter" on forum and discussion procedure, radio and public speaking, is sketchy and of little value.

J. JEFFERY AUER,
Oberlin College

"WORDS, WORDS, WORDS"

New College Standard Dictionary. Emphatype edition. CHARLES EARLE FUNK, Editor. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company. Third printing, May, 1947; pp. xvi+1404. $5.50. With Thumb Index $6.00.

Words: The New Dictionary. CHARLES P. CHADSEY, Editor-in-Chief. New York: Grosset and Dunlap. Third printing, May, 1947; pp. xxxi+704. $2.00.

The American Thesaurus of Slang. With Supplement of Military Slang. By LESTER V. BERREY and MELVIN VAN DEN BARK. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. Fifth printing, January, 1947; pp. xxx+1174; v+57. $6.50.

These three dictionaries should be evaluated in terms of their common aim, which is obviously popular.

From this point of view the pronouncing systems advertised by the first two of them—they are almost identical systems—may be a real contribution in being easy to use. At the same time, there are some doubtful items.

In the *Standard*, no respelling is given for *pass, passable, passage, passenger, passible, pastime*. We may know *pass* without respelling, but what about the other words? *Passable* and *pastime* are like *pass*: they vary from short *a* to *ah*, in the first syllable. But *passenger* and *passage* do not have the *ah* sound even in

Daniel Jones's *English Pronouncing Dictionary*.

A namesake of Daniel Jones, one Stephen Jones, found *passable* and *passible* different in his dictionary of 1728. In those days there was much talk of an "intermediate *a*," on both sides of the Atlantic. Possibly our new dictionaries have done us a good turn in omitting all mention of this half-and-half sound.

In many ways the simplified method does make the pronunciation plain. Yet the disadvantages of oversimplification keep coming up. In both books *Washington* and *wash* have the *ah;* this is better than *worsh* or *woish* but it is not the only fashion, even among General American speakers. *Words* gives only one form for *library*, with *ai* in the third syllable; only one form for *quality* and *quantity*, with *ah* in the first syllable; but three forms for words beginning with *re;* for example, *recess* with *ree; recall* with *rih; refrain* with *reh*. Here is evidently an attempt to distinguish real variants but without a pronouncing key it is difficult to tell just what is meant.

The key-line at the bottom or top of the vocabulary pages might have helped in this case, but it is missing from both *Words* and the *Standard*. Introduced by William Scott in 1786 (see Esther K. Sheldon, *Language*, XXII, pp. 27-41) this useful device was adopted by Walker and soon passed into general usage. The present policy in pronunciation seems to be laissez faire. If carried to its logical conclusion, this may drive the whole business of the sounds of speech out of the general dictionaries into specialized phonetic books. Or is it time for the talking dictionary to take over?

In other ways the *Standard*, billed as "the only basically new dictionary in years," has some excellent features retained from older editions. Gone are the Revised Scientific Alphabet (the first phonetic alphabet ever used in a large general English dictionary) and the elder Funk's enthusiasm for simplified spelling. Remaining, however, are the hospitality to new words, especially scientific terms, and a generous provision of synonyms, antonyms, and the prepositions that belong with the words defined. The latter recall the practical contributions of the late James Fernald.

Examples are:

Dysphasia, dysphonia, phoneme, semantics (but not *general semantics*), *speech disorders* (a "unit phrase"); *avaricious*, with ten synonyms and seven antonyms; *averse* "with to," *conversant* "followed by with, formerly in."

Emphatype helps, but is weakened by grayness of the paper.

Definitions are reasonably clear and complete for 145,000 entries. Among the authorities who were associated with the work are Kemp Malone (Teutonic etymologies), Alice M. Ball (compound words), Cabell Greet ("War Words" and general advisory committee) not to speak of Charles K. Thomas, Jane D. Zimmerman, and the late Hoyt H. Hudson.

Words is superior both in type and in paper. It has no etymologies. Seventy thousand words are defined. It is regrettable that the editors have not stated the basis of their selection. Was it relative frequency of occurrence?

The scholar will ask for better word books and will know where to find them. The average American may derive much benefit from these popular dictionaries, especially if he speaks General American.

The slangopedia sure gets down to turnips on the gumchewing words used when talking United States. It covers all creation from the waterfront to the country where men are men and the plumbing is on the outside, from the mugnority to the snooty cuties, from the ad biz to the brain derbies, with a trailer of new wheezes from teentalkers and a guy named Joe. The authors, Sunkist Berrey and Sandhill Van den Bark, are a smidgeon on the cuff to the word welders of the news mags. They have gone plumb Roget and better in their layout, but if you are only a fifty-fifty logic-chopper you can dial the index for information.

BERT EMSLEY,
The Ohio State University

ECHO AND SILENCE

Applied Architectural Acoustics: By MICHAEL RETTINGER. Brooklyn: The Chemical Publishing Company, 1947; pp. 200. $5.50.

Michael Rettinger's *Applied Architectural Acoustics* is a practical handbook. It supplies useful information, including data and checklists, to guide the architect. For the beginning student the author has included chapters on fundamental concepts and general principles.

The major portion of the book is devoted to discussions of acoustical materials and to specific problems of acoustics as applied to different types of rooms and buildings. There are individual chapters on motion picture theatres, sound stages, broadcasting and television studios, auditoria, etc.

As might be expected from one in the author's profession—he is with the Engineering Department of RCA Victor—Rettinger has emphasized rooms and buildings equipped with electronic sound equipment. Those concerned with

speech and drama—especially those who are planning theatre buildings for the near future—will be disappointed by the small amount of space devoted to buildings for the living actor and drama. In fairness to Mr. Rettinger, it should be added, however, that the same principles are applicable to theatre buildings.

Architects will undoubtedly profit by an examination of this useful book, but they should not substitute it for qualified acoustical engineering advice.

H. D. SELLMAN,
San Diego State College

SPEECH AND HEARING DEFICIENCIES

Overcoming Stammering. By CHARLES PELLMAN. New York: The Beechhurst Press, 1947; pp. xiii+160. $3.00.

The ambitious title of this 160-page volume suggests to the prospective reader that it is a "how to" book. If the title had been "Misconceptions of Stuttering," the contents would have been more accurately described.

Not only does the author devote the greater portion of his book (ten chapters) to criticisms of theories and therapies which he considers fallacious, but he introduces numerous inaccuracies of his own. While it would be unjust to imply that there are no accurate statements in this book, the task of locating them in the illogical maze of reasoning is a difficult one.

Chapter I is titled "The Pattern of Stammering." Under this heading are discussions of the development of speech, why the child begins to stutter, the influence of fear, the personality, and the social and economic effects of stuttering. The author subscribes to a neuro-muscular factor in the development of stuttering. This neuro-physiological component has been discussed previously in other books by different authors and by a host of investigators. If Pellman has attempted to restate one of the neuro-physiological theories, he has introduced errors into his discussion. If his book is not intended to be a restatement of an existing theory, he fails to present supporting evidence for a new theory.

The loose usage of scientific terminology and the emotionally-toned language content can be illustrated with passages from any chapter. The following example is typical: "His speech faculty is suffering from an eccentric and wayward development because of neuro-muscular unbalance." (p. 24)

In a recapitulation at the end of Chapter I, the author succeeds in writing two pages of clear, concise language, relatively free of error.

Chapter II is titled "The Correction of Stammering." Here is found all that might be termed the "how to" content of the entire book. In the first seven pages, Pellman advocates what can be interpreted to mean good mental hygiene. No one can object to good mental hygiene as a therapeutic requirement, but in this book it is not discussed clearly.

Following this aspect of the correction of stammering, the author states, "The stammerer must learn speech anew in order to speak with voice, fluency, and poise; in so doing, he will correct whatever speech faults he has." (p. 55) On the basis of this rationale, the author sets down some drills and methods whereby the stutterer may "learn speech anew." Another assumption which he makes in setting forth his therapy is stated, "As the normal speaker improves his speech, so it is possible for the stammerer to improve his." (p. 56) Again, there is no evidence to indicate that this statement, which is the very basis of the therapy, is valid.

Chapter III, "Help the Child Overcome Stammering," is devoted to advice for the intelligent parent on how to treat stuttering at home. Unfortunately, it takes more than an intelligent parent to gain any constructive information from this chapter. Little more than an increase of confusion can be foreseen from reading it. The trained speech therapist may be able to sift out the scientific facts, but it is unlikely that parents will be able to do so.

The next ten chapters are devoted to criticisms of various theories and practices in the correction of stuttering. The author demonstrates a certain degree of understanding and ability to analyze current practices. In some instances, however, he errs in selecting a single phase of a therapy and misrepresents it as the only aspect of that therapy. The author's attitude toward most existing therapies is reflected in the Introduction (p. 8). "The judgment of many investigators is influenced by dogmatic and backward opinions, accepted with little scrutiny of the sources from which they first emanated, or an understanding of why they originated at all." It is unfortunate that the author has failed to see these faults in his own presentation.

In a footnote (p. 15) the author indicates that the words "stammer" and "stutter" are used synonymously. It is interesting to note that the term "stammering" is employed in the title and throughout the book, although recognized authorities in this country use the term "stuttering."

The reviewer believes that the author is very sincere in his desire and efforts to help the stutterer. The most valuable assistance to stutterers in this book is the plea made for the expansion of speech correction facilities in the public school systems.

M. D. STEER,
Purdue University

Hearing Aids: An Experimental Study of Design Objectives. By HALLOWELL DAVIS, S. S. STEVENS, R. H. NICHOLS, JR., C. V. HUDGINS, R. J. MARQUIS, G. D. PETERSON, and D. A. ROSS. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1947; pp. viii+194. $2.00.

Train Your Hearing. By MARY WOOD WHITEHURST. Washington, D. C.: The Volta Bureau, 1947; pp. viii+90. $3.00.

How To Help Your Hearing. By LOUISE M. NEUSCHUTZ. (Revisd edition). Garden City, New York: Blue Ribbon Books, 1947; pp. xxii+171. $1.00.

In *Hearing Aids,* one of the most provocative reports of research done in connection with war rehabilitation, the authors challenge the generally accepted importance of precision fitting of hearing aids. Using audiograms as a basis, many workers in the field have attempted to supply selective amplification, adjusting instruments in an effort to provide different amounts of amplification of particular frequencies according to the subject's reduced sensitivity to those frequencies. This would require an individual fitting for each wearer.

Employing a master hearing aid the experimenters compared the benefits to hard of hearing subjects (using ability to understand speech among other criteria) when different patterns of amplification were tried. Regardless of the profiles of losses, an amplification pattern with high frequency emphasis proved to be most useful to the largest group of subjects. Flat amplification was the next most useful pattern.

The implications of the study are that a limited number of types of aids will benefit most hard of hearing persons, and that factors other than "mirroring" an audiogram are the most important ones in hearing aid selection.

This publication should be read carefully by all persons who are interested in hearing problems.

Train Your Hearing, is written for hearing aid wearers who should train their residual hearing in order to make the best use of their instruments. The author does not believe that self-training is the best way of achieving this end, but she does recognize the importance of offering practical help for the large number of persons who buy hearing aids, but who are handicapped by lack of knowledge of how to use them.

The author begins with suggestions relative to the wear, care, operation, and personal adjustment to the hearing aid. Following this is a discussion of procedures to be followed in the training. The remainder of the book consists of a series of carefully outlined lessons which the average adult should be able to follow successfully.

Train Your Hearing is an important and useful book. Future revisions of the book by the author and other similar books which will undoubtedly follow might gain from amplifying the definition, objectives, and importance of auricular training. The Volta Bureau has added to its meritorious list one more publication which will benefit acoustically handicapped people.

How To Help Your Hearing is directed to persons who have become deafened or hard of hearing after the onset of puberty. The author appears to aim at helping these individuals accomplish two things: first, establish wholesome attitudes toward their problems, and second, reduce the handicapping nature of those problems.

Taking a chatty, non-academic approach, she discusses a wide variety of items, including acceptance of the fact of hearing loss, lip reading, auricular training, hearing aids, personal adjustment, social adjustment, and vocational adjustment. Much of the information is good, often being presented from unique and provocative points of view. Unfortunately, there are occasional inaccuracies, such as the statement regarding bone conduction receivers for hearing aids, which will probably annoy an informed reader, but may not too seriously mislead the general public toward whom the book is directed.

HAROLD WESTLAKE,
Northwestern University

AMONG THE TEXTBOOKS

The Bases of Speech. By GILES WILKINSON GRAY and CLAUDE MERTON WISE. (Revised edition). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946; pp. 610. $3.50.

The Bases of Speech is a valuable book. It was a notable contribution twelve years ago as a collection of factual materials, basic to an understanding of the speech act. The new edi-

tion extends the scope of the earlier one to include semantics and adds some sub-topics to earlier chapters. The deservedly high favor with which this textbook is held and the unquestioned scholarship that it represents permit one to raise a few questions without disparaging the authors' work.

The late Professor Woodward in reviewing the first edition expressed misgivings about the suitability of the contents for a beginning college course in speech. The authors have now withdrawn pointed references to this application of the book. The question remains, however. The "exercises" are similar (although now condensed) and the acknowledgments identical in the two editions. Obviously the intent remains to recommend the topics for study in Speech 1-2. Are they enough?

The scope of Speech—beginning Speech—usually includes (a) inventing ideas and materials, (b) arranging topics, (c) phrasing the contents, and (d) saying them. Some teachers include additional topics. These particular ones are time honored and apply to many types of speaking performances. The authors of this book pay tribute to writers of fifty centuries who have written about these subjects—Quintilian, Cicero, Aristotle, Plato, and the ancient Ptah Hotep. But Professors Gray and Wise do not follow the paths of their predecessors. Rather, this textbook discusses the natural phenomena that *accompany* the saying of ideas. It does not stress the importance of the inventive process in speaking. The descriptions and explanations that are presented are intriguing facts that have been brought to light through classification and experimentation in late decades. For me, they are stimulating and valuable adjuncts, rarely substitutes, for other contents in Speech 1. They stand alone in an "advanced" course, particularly for students who are preparing to teach Speech 1. For "majors," then, the book is invaluable; for the "general course," possibly it is not enough.

In the main, the text is a compendium of descriptive facts relevant to speech, and the relationships between the act of speaking and the facts are interestingly and clearly presented. Fortunately, such materials are now accumulating rapidly. In fact, from the preface of this book one reads, "More progress has been made in the past fifty years in our knowledge of the speech processes than was made in all previous centuries since Quintilian." Perhaps one-fourth of this progress has occurred in the twelve years since the first edition. The footnotes tend to bear this out. For example, in the chapter on the physical basis of speech there are 27 footnotes (12 in the first edition) and of these, 14 refer to sources that were not available in 1934. This trend toward additional documentation is not evenly present in the new edition, but is pronounced in some chapters, and the revision does both (1) document "old" materials and (2) present new evidence. If another reader agrees with this one that the revision falls a little short of being contemporaneous he will find no support for this impression in a tabulation of footnotes. Doubtless the notion is erroneous. Perhaps it arises from selection of evidence, from lack of reference to visible speech or the work of Fairbanks and others that establishes the connotative values in voice. Needless to say, in view of the scope of the book, some materials had to be omitted. Possibly the slight disappointment—the idea that the book is a little dated, even with publication—is inherent in revisions. The author who has done his task well and has thereby contributed to the planning of courses in speech for several years can hardly add much with a re-editing of a standard textbook. In short, creativeness is principally limited to a first edition. This does not keep the profession from expecting something big when the word leaks out that, "so-and-so is doing a revision." After publication, one senses that the new *Bases of Speech* is not the important contribution this year that a book by Gray and Wise would normally be.

Another question, are some of the materials in *The Bases of Speech* unnecessarily subjective in treatment? In the midst of authenticated facts, every topic may appear to be established objectively. Really, some of the contents need supporting evidence. For example, irrespective of tradition, vocal projection awaits objective identification. Perhaps it is only a descriptive phrase that denotes adequate vocal loudness. Talley's analysis of conversation and audience speech was only a start on this problem. Gray and Wise, however, draw no distinction between projection and the other subject matters that have been rigorously investigated and established.

The new chapter, Semantics, is a helpful summary of the subject. This and Social Basis seem especially to be inevitable chapters in a textbook for classes in speech in 1947-8.

The organization of *The Bases of Speech* rests on good textbook divisions. The bases are pat, like Ruskin's lamps or Jaques' ages. This principle of division results in a few unusual alignments of topics. For example "speech-purposes" and "vocal attributes" are in the same chapter while other materials that are

closely related to each other are scattered widely in the book, as "precise articulation," "assimilation," and "phonetics" respectively in chapters concerned with social, linguistic, and phonetic elements of speech.

If speech has objective measuring techniques they are appropriate as practice and motivating materials in the system for study and improvement in speech that this book presents. By inference, however, with a few exceptions, "hear-guess-repeat" performances are the methods for directing improvement in speech. This failure to carry through the objective approach invites the charge, "pseudo-science, not science." This may be more important than these sentences imply. Even within the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA there are many who see little application of the scientific approach to the study of speech. And among our colleagues in other areas the sentiment is more general. Gray and Wise are on the other side of the fence. Being there, they bear a responsibility for replacing as many subjective techniques as possible with objective approaches. Perhaps they have. If so, speech does not have objective measures for loudness, articulation, pronunciation, intelligibility, etc. We need them in any event; we need them particularly when we present factual descriptions of the genesis and nature of the speech act as the contents of courses. The earlier book was well indexed, and this one even better. This is a fortunate detail in a textbook that has the standing of a source book with teachers and graduate students.

Finally, the book serves two ends, a "beginner's" textbook and a "field" reference work. This is an unusual combination in speech and highly desirable. Analogies from other fields of study are abundant.

Gray and Wise continue in this revision that which may be their major contribution—the addition of factual matter to the student's "guide" to an understanding of speech.

JOHN W. BLACK,
Kenyon College

Public Speaking for Everyone. By JAMES W. ARMSTRONG. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947; pp. xv+246. $3.00.

This textbook in public speaking consists of seven parts:

"Find Your Audience"
"Find Your Message"
"Organize Your Speech"
"Develop Your Points Effectively"
"Make a Good Beginning"
"Close Your Speech Effectively"
"Handle Yourself Well on the Platform".

The first part is preceded by an expression of "The Point of View," a rather wordy but inspirational sales talk. The next six are each preceded by a foreword.

Public Speaking for Everyone is particularly suited to the needs of the adult who does not have access to the assistance of an instructor. It is self-motivating, and teaches the student with a minimum amount of effort on his part.

This satisfies the author, for in his own words, "I have desired to produce a book on public speaking for the use of the general public. I did not want it to be a school book so much as a book that people out in working life—the doctor, the merchant, the engineer, the stenographer, the housewife, the druggist, the preacher, the teacher, the laborer, and citizens in general—could read and find useful. I wanted a book for the working processes of democracy."

This is an inspiring statement of an inspiring objective which requires an inspirational style of writing to achieve. The style is the first admirable characteristic of the text. Every teacher of public speaking will recognize the meaning behind these sparkling phrases:

"To captivate an audience with a subject you yourself must be held captive."
"Awaken to the possibilities of matters close at hand."
"Cultivate your voice friends and eliminate your vocal enemies."
"There are all sizes of 'I'—I ı i *i*."
"Lay hold of the commanding affairs of life and let them lay hold of you."
"Place yourself in the way of experience in the raw."
"Look upon speech materials with a transforming eye."
"Look next to the ribs of your proof."
"Screened Approach." (In referring to the practice of withholding the end or aim of the speech until the last.)
"To talk to people, turn to them your own human side; address yourself as much as possible to their human side."

For the average adult, this style will serve to carry him through a text which he might not otherwise read without compulsion.

A second asset of the book is that it is human. One of the best chapters, "Find People When You Talk," opens the book. Surely every so-called rule and principle in public speaking arises out of the fact that a speaker deals with other people. It is regrettable that the author spent such little time in developing this.

The best chapters are IV, "Find the Subject that Commands You"; IX, "A Fourth Natural

Way of Organizing Your Speech"; XI, "State Them Well"; XII, "Define Your Terms"; XIV, "Paint the Picture"; XV, "Use Facts"; and XVII, "Facing the Hostile Audience."

The author suggests a total of fifteen different methods of organizing a speech. These are embodied in four separate chapters which might have been strengthened through combination.

Many teachers of public speaking, who believe in the power of visual aids, will be surprised by the admonition, "use . . . anything of a visual nature that you can lay your hands on to create an interest in the subject." The matter of the use of visual aids is highly specialized and deserves better treatment.

Those of us who are most concerned with "objectivity" in speaking will be somewhat concerned with the author's advice, "begin by talking about yourself."

Public Speaking for Everyone best suits the adult working by himself; it is not recommended for college classes.

ORMOND J. DRAKE,
New York University

Speaking and Speeches. By ROBERT LOHAN. New York: Stephen Daye Press, 1947; pp. 279. $2.75.

This book is intended to help students develop pleasing and effective speech in order to achieve success in social and professional life.

Dr. Lohan says it is designed for a two-semester fundamentals course in speaking and speech composition, but that it also should be useful for self-training. It is difficult to discover how the work completely fulfills either aim, principally because the material is not inclusive enough, and the treatments given some subjects are not overly clear. Where there is sufficient emphasis on what ought to be done, there is insufficient explicit explanation of how it should be accomplished. For example, the author approaches the problem of expressive speaking through the scansion of poetry and prose. He gives just enough, it seems to me, to confuse the beginning student.

Part I, "Speaking," is exclusively devoted to voice production, pronunciation, and expressive speaking. The influence of Gestalt psychology is evident.

Part II contains material for the platform speaker: background, delivery, selection and organization of materials, etc., with a concluding chapter on oratorical style.

The most helpful chapters in the book are those devoted to a discussion of the introduction and the conclusion of a speech. They profit from an adequate number of well-chosen examples from modern and classical models.

Almost completely lacking are such important subjects as phonetics, platform behavior, gesture and movement, specific purpose, motivation, audience and occasion analysis, methods of support, factors of attention, and the personal qualifications of the speaker. Speech classifications according to the general ends are treated briefly, but no attention is given to a distinction among plans and preparations for the various types as such. The book contains only one chart; no pictures, no diagrams. No model speeches are given, no bibliography, no supplementary references. Drill exercises are included at the end of and within the various chapters.

Brevity and simplicity characterize the style throughout. An air of informality and intimacy, which makes for easy reading, if not always for profound reading, permeates the whole.

Dr. Lohan's philosophy seems to coincide with modern trends in speech education, and his book is filled with "sentence sermons" which should mean much to the student or teacher. Even so, the reader now and then receives a jolt when he discovers passages such as "The student of public speaking will, in his beginning stages, write out his speech and memorize it."

HOWARD W. TOWNSEND,
University of Texas

Speech: A High School Course. By LEW SARETT, WILLIAM TRUFANT FOSTER, and JAMES H. MCBURNEY. (Revised edition). Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947; pp. 490. $2.20.

The original edition of *Speech: A High School Course* was so ably reviewed by Professor Bower Aly in the February, 1944 issue of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH that it is hardly necessary again to extol its favorable features. I have used the book as a basic text in a general speech course of the survey type, with high school juniors and seniors. It has been a pleasure to teach from it.

Aly, in his review, indicated some material which in his opinion was of doubtful value. It is interesting to note that the revised edition contains the same material. In fact, the revised edition follows page for page the original issue. This is in some ways desirable because it is possible to use both editions in the same class. However, bookstores frequently do not recognize this possibility, and refuse to "buy in" used copies of an earlier edition, thus providing another opportunity for the public school's critics to attack the frequent changes in textbooks.

The only changes in the new edition are these: (1) the page of pictures following page 56 has been changed to provide illustrations of people who are living at the present time, (2) a new appendix has been added and given a number one spot, and (3) Appendix III has been reorganized. The newly added appendix contains a list of words for further drill exercises in pronunciation.

In my opinion, if a book is to be revised, surely the content should be changed enough to merit the label "revised edition."

G. BRADFORD BARBER,
Illinois State Normal University

MORE BRIEFLY NOTED

Hamlet. Edited by GEORGE RYLANDS. The New Clarendon Shakespeare. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1947; pp. 256. $1.25.

Romeo and Juliet. Edited by RALPH E. C. HOUGHTON. The New Clarendon Shakespeare. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1947; pp. 192. $1.25.

The New Clarendon Shakespeare aims primarily at presenting the texts of Shakespeare's plays in such a way that they can be easily read and understood. The notes below the text are translations into current speech of Elizabethan usage and vocabulary, while those placed in a commentary at the end of each play are interpretations of more difficult expressions and allusions. This is an excellent arrangement for editions designed to lead students to an enjoyment of Shakespeare rather than a scholarly evaluation of him.

The introduction to *Hamlet* by George Rylands is stimulating in its division of the play into movements. This is an adaptation of H. Granville-Barker's interpretation, and has value in counteracting the spurious divisions into acts and scenes which are still included in the texts. Ralph E. C. Houghton has written a more conventional introduction to *Romeo and Juliet* which includes the usual material concerning quartos and folios. Such data seem somewhat pointless for the beginning student. Both books are enlivened by some good halftone illustrations of modern productions of the plays.

Twentieth Century Plays: American. Edited by RICHARD A. CORDELL. (Third edition). New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947; pp. xi+329. $2.50.

Twentieth Century Plays: British, American, Continental. Edited by RICHARD A. CORDELL. (Third edition). New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947; pp. xi+447. $3.00.

The volume of American plays includes *Anna Christie, Abe Lincoln in Illinois, Street Scene, The Green Pastures, The Silver Cord, The Little Foxes, Winterset,* and *The Late George Apley.* The second volume conains the same plays with the exception of *The Green Pastures* and *The Silver Cord,* and adds *The Admirable Crichton, The Silver Box, The Circle, Cyrano de Bergerac,* and *R.U.R.*

Thus, with the exception of the British plays and *The Late George Apley,* these collections print the conventional anthology pieces. The introduction to each play is adequate, expressing for the most part standard critical opinions. Short supplementary reading lists are appended.

Typographically the books are poor. The introductions and texts of the plays are set in type small enough to make extended reading a hazard, while character names are so large by comparison that they act as annoying hurdles for the eye.

Best Plays for the Church. Compiled by MILDRED B. HAHN. Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, 1947; pp. 64. $.60.

A carefully annotated checklist of plays, pageants, readings, and resource books "for those who are concerned about using drama in the program of the church."

Brief but adequate introductory remarks warn the inexperienced teacher of some of the pitfalls to be avoided in casting and producing a religious play, training a voice choir, and preparing students to present individual readings and recitations.

Miss Hahn's system of classifying and cross-indexing entries enhances considerably the value of the book.

Hand-and-Rod Puppets: A New Adventure in the Art of Puppetry. By MARJORIE BATCHELDER and VIVIAN MICHAEL. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1947; pp. ix+74. $1.25.

This is the first booklet of a Fine Arts Series to be published by The Ohio State University under the title "Adventures in Education." In it the authors describe their experiments with the hand-and-rod puppet on both the college and junior high school levels. They found the hand-and-rod puppet to be a more flexible, spontaneous, and more forcibly dramatic tool than other forms of puppets more frequently used by students.

Not only for students and teachers, this booklet will be a most interesting and valuable addition to the library of anyone interested in

puppets for their dramatic value. In addition to complete diagrams and instructions for making this type of puppet, and the stage, settings, and properties, there are 15 photographs showing the actual puppets and the plays which were part of the experiment.

Introduction to Aristotle. Edited, with a General Introduction and Introductions to the Particular Works by RICHARD MCKEON. New York: The Modern Library, 1947; pp. xxix+667. $1.10.

This volume will be welcomed by students of the history of rhetorical theory. It makes available, at an unbelievably low cost, the best obtainable English translations of nearly all of the Aristotelian treatises which are of direct concern in connection with the study of *Rhetorica.*

The Ross texts of *Analytica Posteriora, De Anima, Ethica Nicomachea,* and *Poetica* are presented in their entirety. In addition, there are selections from *Physica, Metaphysica,* and *Politica.*

McKeon's introductions, although they are written for the layman rather than the scholar, are both judicious and illuminating, and his analytical outlines of the contents of each of the works increase the usefulness of this most valuable edition.

Educators Guide to Free Films. Compiled by MARY FOLEY HORKHEIMER and JOHN W. DIFFOR. (Seventh edition). Randolph, Wisconsin: Educators Progressive Service, 1947; pp. xi+341. $5.00.

The seventh annual revised edition of this useful guide lists and describes briefly 1,755 free films and 174 free slidefilms which may be obtained from governmental agencies, philanthropic organizations, independent "text-film" or "teaching-film" production companies, and industrial and commercial concerns.

A "Source and Availability Index" gives the addresses of distributing organizations and indicates the conditions under which films are loaned.

Unfortunately, only a very few of the titles listed bear directly upon speech. However, the teacher will find here a wealth of material on related subjects.

Using Audio Visual Materials With Children. Edited by FRANCES MAYFARTH. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1947; pp. 36. $.50.

A discussion of the use of recordings, radio programs, and films in the elementary school curriculum, together with suggestions for administering and supervising a program of audio visual education.

United Nations or World Government. Compiled by JULIA E. JOHNSEN. The Reference Shelf, Vol. XIX, No. 5. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1947; pp. 285. $1.25.

A compilation of materials on the national debate topic for 1947-48 which is in line with the standards set in earlier volumes of The Reference Shelf series.

IN THE PERIODICALS

GIRAUD CHESTER, *Editor*

GIFFORD S. BLYTON ..... *Teaching*
Western Michigan College
WINSTON L. BREMBECK ..... *Rhetoric*
University of Wisconsin
GIRAUD CHESTER ..... *Radio*
Cornell University
HAROLD WEISS ..... *Language*
Southern Methodist University
JOHN V. IRWIN ..... *Science*
University of Minnesota
JACK MATTHEWS ..... *Pathology*
University of Pittsburgh
HUGH Z. NORTON ..... *Drama*
University of Michigan

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

AARON, DANIEL, "Thorstein Veblen: Moralist and Rhetorician," *The Antioch Review*, VII (Fall, 1947), 381-90.

Veblen is viewed in this article not as an economist or sociologist, as is often the case, but as a moralist and rhetorician. Aaron compares Veblen with Thoreau.

EDEN, CHARLES, "Edmund Burke, 1797-1947," *The Contemporary Review*, No. 980 (August, 1947), 99-102.

One hundred and fifty years after his death, the life of Edmund Burke is rapidly reviewed and re-appraised.

GERHARD, W. A., "Plato's Theory of Dialectic," *The New Scholasticism*, XXI (April, 1947), 192-211.

The writer analyzes Plato's theory of dialectic and compares it with that of Socrates.

JAVITS, J. K., "How I Used a Poll Campaigning for Congress," *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, II (Summer, 1947), 222-26.

A congressman from the 21st district of New York describes the way in which a special survey, conducted for him by Elmo Roper, became an integral part of his campaign for re-election.

KAY, LILLIAN WALD, "An Experimental Approach to Prestige Suggestion," *The Journal of Psychology*, XXIV (July, 1947), 71-82.

In a day when "people who have achieved success in one field (usually entertainment) are attempting to sell everything from the traditional beauty aids and cigarettes, to philosophy and political candidates," it is well to approach the matter of prestige suggestion experimentally. Frank Sinatra's campaigns to change certain attitudes of adolescents provide the experimental subject matter.

LINK, H. C., "Some Milestones in Public Opinion Research," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXXI (June, 1947), 225-34.

Link reviews the developments in public opinion research and discusses different methods used by experimenters.

LUDWIG, EMIL, "The Art of Interviewing," *The Contemporary Review*, No. 979 (July, 1947), 20-7.

A world famous interviewer reveals some of his observations on the art of interviewing.

MCKEON, RICHARD, "Aristotle's Conception of Language and the Arts of Language (Part II)," *Classical Philology*, XLII (January, 1947), 21-50.

The author re-examines Aristotle's view on human thought and its expression. "In each of the arts of language, Aristotle laid down lines of technical analysis and established basic terms in technical significance."

SCHONBAR, ROSALEA ANN, "The Modification of Judgments in a Group Situation," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXVII (February, 1947), 69-80.

The experiment reported in this article attempts to answer the question: does the presence of a co-acting group operate to cause the individual to give less extreme judgment than he would render when alone? The experiment follows the approach used by F. H. Allport in a similar study made in 1924.

WARNER, LUCIEN, "What is an Audience?" *Advertising & Selling*, XL (July, August, and September, 1947), 35ff., 41ff., 39ff.

In a series of three articles, an associate director of research for *Life* magazine tells sales-

men and advertisers how to determine the composition of commercial audiences.

WITMAN, SHEPHERD L., "Let's Talk Things Over Right," *National Municipal Review*, XXXVI (June, 1947), 310-15.

A former director of the Omaha Public Affairs Forum explains how discussion methods can bring understanding between the citizenry and civic planning groups.

RADIO

BARTLETT, KENNETH G., "Social Impact of the Radio," *Annals of the American Academy*, CCL (March, 1947), 89-97.

Bartlett discusses programming, advertising, audience measurement, political problems, news reporting, public attitudes, and criticisms of radio. "The importance of getting better programs, particularly of the more serious type, cannot be over-emphasized."

BRODERICK, GERTRUDE G., "Radio in the Curriculum," *School Life*, XXIX (April, 1947), 28-9.

"Fifty-three colleges and universities last year reported courses in teacher preparation and classroom use of radio, nearly a fifty percent increase over pre-war years," Miss Broderick states. "Many secondary schools now are teaching radio appreciation as a part of a course of study in dramatic arts."

CHESTER, GIRAUD, "Kaltenborn Edits the News," *American Mercury*, LXV (October, 1947), 391-402.

A critical evaluation of H. V. Kaltenborn's radio commentaries since 1932 is accompanied by an analysis of his persuasive techniques and influence. The writer, who had access to confidential correspondence files, discusses network, sponsor, and public pressures on Kaltenborn.

GOTTLIEB, LILLIAN, "Radio and Newspaper Reports of the Heirens Murder Case," *Journalism Quarterly*, XXIV (June, 1947), 97-108.

This study compares the treatment of a murder case by a Chicago radio station and by a number of Chicago daily newspapers through the technique of content analysis. The finding of the study is that the newspapers not only played up the case more than did the radio station, but exhibited a greater propensity toward slanting the news against the alleged murderer.

HENRY, GEORGE H., "Shakespeare's Heavy Rivals," *Survey Graphic*, XXXVI (March, 1947), 187-89ff.

"Our colossal public school system is playing but a minor role in the education of our youth" as compared with the movies, radio, and press which "grow more irresponsible in their debasement of taste, their materialism, their false values." The writer suggests that curricula be so modified as to allow full scale courses in the study of mass communication media.

HUDSON, ROBERT B., "Civic Education via the Radio," *National Municipal Review*, XXXVI (April, 1947), 189-93.

"It behooves municipal authorities to awake to the potentialities of radio as an instrument of civic education and to train personnel to use the medium effectively." Hudson describes a number of civic educational programs now on the air.

LEAR, JOHN, "You Can't Say That on the Air," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXX (July 12, 1947), 22-3ff.

"A storm of criticism is gathering against what writers, producers, and performers increasingly persist in calling censorship." The continuity acceptance procedures of the networks are described with numerous examples of censorship in action.

MUHLEN, NORBERT, "Radio: Political Threat or Promise?" *Commentary*, III (March, 1947), 201-09.

"While no scientific, objective analysis of the contents of radio programs has yet been made, the over-all impression is that most radio programs of all types aim at neutrality and balanced presentation, with little deviation to the extremes, a decreasing number of intolerant voices, and an increasing volume of tolerance propaganda."

NOVIK, M. S., "Labor on the Air," *American Federationist*, LIV (June, 1947), 819ff.

Novik describes the efforts of the American Federation of Labor to mobolize public opinion against the Taft-Hartley bill through a series of network broadcasts utilizing name talent. The campaign was "the first of its kind in American radio and labor history."

"REVOLT AGAINST RADIO," *Fortune*, XXXV (March, 1947), 100-03ff.

Criticisms of radio are presented together with rebuttals from industry spokesmen. "Today it looks very much as if any substantial improvement in the standards of American radio must wait on the rise in the industry, from within or without, of directing personalities willing to

take a chance on higher quality—because they get a satisfaction from higher quality and because they have a conviction that eventually it will pay."

SPINGARN, JEROME, "Radio is Yours," *Public Affairs Pamphlet*, No. 121 (1946).

Spingarn offers a critical review of various aspects of radio: programming, discussion of public issues, political pressures, business interests, newspaper-radio tie-ups, and FM. "The rights of the listener to good programs, like any other rights, must be defended actively, day after day, if they are to be preserved."

TIMBERG, ELEANOR E., "Mythology of Broadcasting," *Antioch Review*, VI (September, 1946), 354-67.

The writer, who did the research on radio for Ernst's *First Freedom*, raises these questions: How free is the American broadcaster in writing and selecting his programs? How much do listeners' desires affect the choice of programs? Does the "air belong to the people" any more? She concludes that "the public does not now hear the voice of its many minorities, of labor, or of consumer groups to any representative extent. Ideas which might arouse vigorous controversy, and antagonize sponsors, on the whole receive no air time."

WHITE, LLEWELLYN, "Shortcomings of Radio," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXIX (April, 1947), 64-70.

This article summarizes some of the conclusions reported to the Commission on Freedom of the Press by its assistant director in charge of research on radio.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

BROWN, IVOR, "The Amateur Theatre," *Britain Today*, CXXXVIII (October, 1947), 25-8.

Brown pays tribute to the amateur theatre of Great Britain by sketching its history from pre-Tudor days to the Marlowe Society of Cambridge University today.

BROWN, IVOR, "The Impossibility of Criticism," *Theatre Newsletter*, II (September 20, 1947), 6-7.

This is Brown's speech on the function of professional criticism delivered during the Edinburgh Festival of 1947.

CHUKOVSKI, KORNEI, "Friend Chekhov," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXX (September, 1947), 84-90.

"The generous, buoyant, all-consuming vitality of Anton Pavlovich Chekhov," as well as his personal reactions to the theatre and the world about him, are revealed in quotations from letters which have never previously been translated into English.

CORSON, RICHARD, "Styles of Scene Design," *Dramatics*, XIX (October, 1947), 7-8.

"It is both convenient and useful for the student of drama and the aspiring designer to be able to talk correctly and intelligently about stage design." The purpose of this article and of the six more which Mr. Corson promises is to formulate and define a set of "concrete and meaningful descriptive" terms relating to stage design. Six drawings accompany the article.

DOWNER, ALLAN S., "Harley Granville-Barker," *The Sewanee Review*, LV (Autumn, 1947), 627-45.

Downer describes and analyses the several careers of Granville-Barker which led to his writing of "Prefaces to Shakespeare." As a successful actor, director, producer, playwright, essayist, and theatrical revolutionary, Granville-Barker rose through practical knowledge rather than by way of theory, to his critical eminence. He was not so much a critic of the theatre as a critic in and for the theatre. Shaw and Gielgud assisted Downer in preparing this article.

DREYFUSS, HENRY, "Four-Square Theatre," *Hollywood Quarterly*, II (July, 1947), 367-70.

The idea of the Circular Theatre, which has been successfully tried for stage drama, is recommended by Dreyfuss for the motion picture house. "The Four-Square Theatre" projects "the picture on four screens placed in the center of the building and facing four different audiences. The projection room is placed above the screens, and the picture is thrown on them by means of mirrors." Three auditorium plans and two drawings accompany the article.

OGILVIE, VIVIAN, "Three Characters in Hamlet," *Britain Today*, CXXXVIII (October, 1947), 13-17.

Encouraged by the prospect of a fresh new *Hamlet* by Sir Laurence Olivier (motion picture version), Miss Ogilvie speculates on some of the "bold alterations and innovations" which Olivier has the opportunity to make. She explains the need for a thorough reinvestigation of "three sadly abused characters": the Ghost, the First Player, and Polonius.

QUINN, SEABURY, "Macready's Farewell to New York," *Theatre Arts*, XXXI (October, 1947), 64-7.

Using a narrative approach, Quinn offers detailed information on the famous Astor Place riots which shamed the American theatre in 1849.

SAVAGE, GEORGE, "Tryout Theatre and the Manuscript Play," *Players Magazine*, XXIV (October, 1947), 3-5.

Savage describes the activities of the amateur theatre at the University of Washington. "Every theatre can't plan an entire schedule of new plays," Savage writes. "But no city has *living* theatre unless it includes in its program at least one manuscript play each year because living theatre is creative theatre."

SESSIONS, INA BETH, "The Dramatic Monologue," *PMLA*, LXII (June, 1947), 503-16.

"Through the years detailed attention has been given to the lyric, epic, short-story, drama, novel, and other literary forms, but comparatively few references have been made to the dramatic monologus." Sessions summarizes the scholarship to date, and adds a study of her own.

STUART, MARION, "Rehearsing the Play," *Dramatics*, XIX (October, 1947), 9-10.

Using her experience as director of dramatics at the Champaign, Illinois, Senior High School as a basis for observation, Miss Stuart discusses the methods of rehearsing a play.

VON KLEIST, HEINRICH, "Essay on the Puppet Theatre," *Partisan Review*, XIV (January-February, 1947), 67-72.

This is a translation by Eugene Jolas of von Kleist's important and colorful essay on the art of puppetry.

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

CLIFFORD, COLONEL E. H. M., "Recording Native Place Names," *The Geographical Journal*, CIX (July, 1947), 99-102.

The writer advises using as much phonetic detail as possible in recording native place names and recommends the R.G.S. II system of transcription with recourse only sparingly to the diacritics for long and short vowels.

GREEN, HAROLD E., "Eleven Principles for Effective Communication Between Employer and Employee," *Printers Ink*, 220 (September 26, 1947), 27-9.

A clear and direct two-way channel is an absolute necessity for building labor relations in which the employee believes in top management and the employer believes in his employees. Green offers a "revised, restated employee-employer communication guide and a check list of the available tools of today."

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H., "An Unnoted Source of English Dialect Vocabulary," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XLVI (April, 1947), 177-82.

Lawrence Nowell's *Vocabularium Saxonicum*, a manuscript dictionary of Old English (chiefly Lancashire dialect) compiled between 1561 and 1566, is noted by the writer as one of the two most important early compilations of the English language. Markwardt asks that Nowell be recognized as "a pioneer not only in the field of lexicography, but in the fields of dialect study and linguistic history as well."

MILLER, GEORGE A., "The Masking of Speech," *Psychological Bulletin*, XLIV (March, 1947), 105-29.

The writer investigated a wide variety of sounds to determine the extent to which they interfered with vocal communication. "Masking depends primarily on the speech-to-noise ratio over the range of frequencies involved in speech. Annoyance increases as the intensity is raised, but there is no evidence that annoyance interferes with vocal communication in the laboratory situation."

PAINTER, MARGARET, "Oral Emphasis in the English Class," *The English Journal*, XXXVI (September, 1947), 348-52.

"The plan for learning oral techniques as the means to self-realization and more effective communication should be progressive so that the work of each semester will be guided by specific goals." The writer presents a list of oral activities for the classroom. "Give each assignment a definite focal point and make it a step forward in oral effectiveness."

SWADESH, MORRIS, "On the Analysis of English Syllabics," *Language*, XXIII (April-June, 1947) 137-150.

"More recently phonemic theory has posed the problem whether the non-short syllabics are unit phonemes or sequences of two phonemes each." The writer discusses this question in light of some recent laboratory studies.

WEITZ, MORRIS, "Philosophy and the Abuse of Language," *The Journal of Philosophy*, XLIV (September 25, 1947), 533-46.

Weitz examines the argument that "traditional philosophy is nothing but bad language or

that good philosophy is nothing but linguistic therapy. If our analysis has been adequate, it follows that there is a good deal of merit to the traditional view that philosophy is concerned with very important non-linguistic problems, in the solution of which it may quite correctly call for a complete rewording of the inaccurate language of common sense."

WINETROUT, KENNETH, "What's In a Name? Communications or English?" *Junior College Journal*, XVIII (September, 1947), 34-6.

"It is suggested that we call our writing courses 'communications,' not 'English.'" We need to train "persons to be communications instructors, not leave this important task to individuals who are temporarily delayed on their academic trip upward."

SPEECH SCIENCE

BROOKS, C. MCC., *and* J. C. ECCLES, "Electrical Investigation of the Monosynaptic Pathway Through the Spinal Cord," *Journal of Neurophysiology*, X (July, 1947), 251-73.

The authors describe a study of the electrical events at synapses of the monosynaptic pathway through the mammalian spinal cord and conclude that their "observations agree closely with the predictions of the electrical hypothesis of synaptic transmission."

DE ROSA, LOUIS A., "A Theory as to the Function of the Scala Tympani in Hearing," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XIX (July, 1947), 623-28.

"The scala tympani canal is assumed to be coupled to the scala vestibuli of the cochlea throughout its length. If the mathematics are formulated for this premise" there is "an area of maximum stimulation of the basilar membrane as a function of pitch."

DOUGHTY, J. M., *and* W. R. GARNER, "Pitch Characteristics of Short Tones. I. Two Kinds of Pitch Threshold," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXVII (August, 1947), 351-65.

For both "tone-pitch" and "click-pitch," the authors find that the thresholds "vary to some extent with both frequency and intensity, and that the difference in duration between the two thresholds is relatively constant for all conditions. The duration required for both types of threshold decreases as the frequency increases to about 500 cps. Beyond that the threshold is relatively constant."

GARNER, W. R., "Accuracy of Binaural Loudness Matching With Repeated Short Tones," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXVII (August, 1947), 337-50.

These experiments were designed primarily to show how the duration and repetition rate of tones affect the binaural intensity-disparity threshold. Representative finding: "Variability between O's in determining the point of equal loudness is much greater than the average variability within O's. O's differ in the intensity required for equal loudness at the two ears by as much as 25 db. under certain conditions."

GARNER, W. R., and G. A. MILLER, "The Masked Threshold of Pure Tones an a Function of Duration," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXVII (August, 1947), 293-303.

The authors investigated "the relation between the duration and the threshold for pure tones masked by a noise spectrum." Typical findings: (1) The ear integrates energy linearly up to 200 msec.; (2) For durations longer than 200 msec., the change in sensitivity is slight and acoustic integration may be considered complete at approximately one second.

KEYS, JOHN W., "Binaural Versus Monaural Hearing," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XIX (July, 1947), 629-31.

This study is concerned "with the relative sensitivity of binaural as compared to monaural hearing for pure tones and speech as exhibited by 'normal' and hard of hearing subjects at threshold levels." The author suggests that "the amount of binaural gain is dependent upon the amount of binaural stimulation, which in turn is dependent up to a certain limit upon the size of the disparity between the two ears."

LARRABEE, M. G., and D. W. BRONK, "Prolonged Facilitation of Synaptic Excitation in Sympathetic Ganglia," *Journal of Neurophysiology*, X (March, 1947), 139-54.

On the basis of experiments performed on the stellate ganglia of cats, Larrabee and Bronk suggest that "trains of nervous impulses, in sympathetic ganglia, at least, modify the characteristics of the synaptic region for considerable periods of time."

MORROW, CHARLES T., "Reaction of Small Enclosures on the Human Voice, Part I. Specifications Required for Satisfactory Intelligibility," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XIX (July, 1947), 645-52.

"The intelligibility obtainable through an enclosure increases when either the resonant frequency or the effective diameter is increased. In general, the intelligibility will be satisfactory if the resonant frequency is at least as high as 1500 cycles per second, provided that the effective diameter is at least 1.24 inches."

MUNSON, W. A., "The Growth of Auditory Sensation," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*, XIX (July, 1947), 584-91.

"The observed increase in magnitude of a sensation as the duration time is increased is attributed to the integration characteristic of the central nervous system." The circuit analogy is "used in the computation of loudness as a function of the duration of the stimulus."

PERLMAN, H. B., "Some Physical Properties of the Conduction Apparatus," *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, LVI (June, 1947), 334-46.

Dr. Perlman finds the resonance frequency of the conduction apparatus (750 cps) to be below that of the maximum sensitivity of the ear as expressed in the threshold curve (3000 cps). Other specific findings with respect to the conduction apparatus are discussed.

SIMPSON, W. LIKELY, and JONES E. WITCHER, "A Study of the Eustachian Tubes and Their Orifices and Lumens in Patients With Large Operative Defects Giving Direct Visualization," *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, LVI (June, 1947), 357-67.

"The movements of the soft palate, uvula, eustachian tube and lateral walls of the pharynx in pronouncing the vowels and consonants are the same except for degree." They conclude: (1) The normal eustachian tube is open at all times, (2) No voluntary movement closes or occludes the eustachian tube.

WARD, ARTHUR A., "Decerebrate Rigidity," *Journal of Neurophysiology*, X (March, 1947), 89-101.

"The hypothesis is advanced that both NaCN and appropriate lesions in the midbrain produce decerebrate rigidity by interrupting all afferent impulses to the bulbar suppressor region, thereby causing a deprivation-paralysis of that structure. The faciliatory region in the lateral pontile tegmentum, however continues to receive afferent impulses from the cranial nerve nuclei as well as from the cord, and thus its faciliatory influence on the internuncial pools of the cord continues unchecked."

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

CHASE, W. LINWOOD, "The Junior Town Meeting," *NEA Journal*, XXXVI (October, 1947), 513.

"The Junior Town Meeting is a dynamic approach to student thinking on current affairs." Its purpose is "to teach tolerance, reason, and justice through active experiences with divergent views; to create opportunity for the exercise of freedom of speech and of assembly by our youth; to create appreciation for the values in discussion; and to give high school students experiences which may serve them later in the councils of their city, state, and nation."

CORTRIGHT, RUPERT L., "We Teach Speech In Detroit," *NEA Journal*, XXXVI (September, 1947), 440-41.

The writer tells how Detroit "trains for speech" its 220,000 pupils. Speech correction, reading, radio, and the speakers bureau are some of the ways considered.

DILLEY, LOIS ANNE, "Discussion: A New Technique For The Classroom," *The English Journal*, XXXVI (October, 1947), 412-19.

In a comparative evaluation of debate and discussion, the author points out that discussion has more to offer as a classroom technique. Discussion is particularly stressed as a valuable technique for "thinking clearly about underlying values in reading, for integrating these ideas with other experiences, and for relating them to the complex world of the adolescent."

HARDY, ROGER A., "Group Discussion, The Democratic Technique for Educating Citizens," *Education*, LXVIII (September, 1947), 24-8.

After affirming that discussion is a democratic tool, the author suggests a plan for adapting discussion to classroom use in the public schools.

MCCARTHY, AGNES, "Teaching Communication to Slow Learners," *The English Journal*, XXXVI (October, 1947), 401-07.

"Language usage, both oral and written, should be developed at least to the point where a simple conversation can be carried on, simple letters written, and common forms and reports such as are required in industry and business can be prepared intelligently." Our aim in teaching communication should be to help the slow learner to acquire the abilities which society demands of everyone.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

BANGS, JACK L., "Bibliography: Esophageal Speech," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 339-41.

The author has compiled a critical annotated bibliography dealing with esophageal speech.

BROWN, FRANCES M., "A Velopharyngeal Exercise," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 279-80.

Directions are given for constructing a nose cap which when properly fitted allows air to come through either the nose or mouth. The nasal stream is diverted in such a way that objects to be blown will move only if air is coming through the mouth. The nose cap has proved useful with both adolescent and adult post-operative cleft palate cases.

BROWN, GRACE T., "Speech Correction in the Rochester, New York, Schools," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 334-38.

"This article recounts the beginnings and the development of one of America's oldest public school speech correction programs."

CHAPIN, AMY BISHOP, "Community Speech and Hearing Clinics," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 331-33.

The organization and operation of a community speech and hearing clinic (The Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center) is described.

CHRYSANTHIS, KYPROS, "Stammering and Handedness," *Lancet*, CCLII (1947), 270-71.

Results of speech examinations of 1133 pupils in elementary schools of Nicosia, Cyprus are summarized. Stammering is discussed from the standpoint of handedness, intelligence, heredity, "race," and sex.

EISENSON, JON, "Aphasics: Observations and Tentative Conclusions," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 263-78.

This paper is concerned with observations and subjective clinical impressions growing out of the writer's experience with aphasic patients in Army hospitals.

ELIASBURG, W., "The Social Implications of Dysphasia," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, CV (1947), 465-76.

Many of the disorders of the dysphasic reflect social-psychological factors rather than purely organic factors. The social-psychological needs of the dysphasic should be considered in planning a re-training program.

HEDGECOCK, LEROY D., "A University Hearing Aid Clinic," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 323-30.

The organization and operation of the University of Minnesota hearing aid clinic is described.

HENDERSON, FLORENCE M., and HENRIETTA C. KRANTZ, "Hypothyroidism, Basil Metabolic Rates and Cleft Palate in Hawaii," "Relationship Between Maternal Ancestry and Incidence of Cleft Palate," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 263-78.

An examination of data obtained from birth certificates and registrations of cleft palates in the files of the Territorial Board of Health in Honolulu for the period from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1947, showed slight evidence that the production of cleft palate children is positively correlated with the number and recency of fusion of color fractions in maternal ancestry. Neither hypothyroidism, iodine lack, nor low metabolic rates of mothers can be considered causes of the high rate of cleft palate in Hawaii.

IRWIN, ORVIS C., "Infant Speech: The Problem of Variability," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (June, 1947), 173-76.

Equations were derived and curves plotted to describe variability of infant speech sounds in terms of phoneme type and phoneme frequency. A comparative analysis of the variability of the fifteen phoneme type distributions shows that they decrease in variability with age, whereas phoneme frequency variability increases during the same period.

IRWIN, ORVIS C., "Infant Speech: Variability and the Problem of Diagnosis," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 287-89.

This study discusses the diagnostic use of percentile curves for phoneme type and phoneme frequency in the speech of infants.

KANTNER, CLAUDE E., "The Rationale of Blowing Exercises for Patients With Repaired Cleft Palates," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 281-86.

One purpose of blowing exercises is often overlooked. It is to teach the patient to direct the air stream through the mouth. Suggestions are given for using blowing exercises.

THORN, KATHERINE, "'Client-Centered' Therapy for Voice and Personality Cases," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (September, 1947), 314-18.

Suggestions are given for applying Roger's "Client-Centered Therapy" to voice cases which are a result of personality problems.

NEWS AND NOTES

ROBERT F. RAY, *Editor*

THE UNITED NATIONS NEWSLETTER

The Department of Public Information of the United Nations plans to publish a Newsletter either fortnightly or monthly and to make it available in bulk lots of 100 or more to organized groups and institutions for distribution to their members at an annual rate of 25 cents per year per individual subscription.

The Newsletter will appear in the two working languages of the United Nations, English and French. Editions in languages other than English and French are being planned for distribution on a basis similar to that described above, each edition being started when sufficient orders have been received to meet printing costs.

Copies of the trial issues may be obtained free of charge by addressing the United Nations Newsletter, Lake Success, New York.

PLANS AND PROGRESS

At Baylor University: Miss Dorothy Hanson is developing a program in Speech Correction. She taught her first course in the 1947 summer school.

At the University of Denver: Jaspar V. Garland is co-ordinating a program of training for Ph.D. and M.A. candidates and directing a seminar in Research Methodologies and Studies.

WLSU, new FM station, opened in November at Louisiana State University. Director, Ralph Steetle; Program Director, Lucille Ruby; and Engineer, B. L. Gibson.

The New York State Speech Association was four years old on December 29. Speech teachers who at present are not members of that state association are encouraged to join and participate in the affairs of the organization. Interested teachers should write either Joseph A. Kuhn, Long Beach High School, New York, or Mrs. Mary Lou Plugge, Adelphi College, Garden City, New York, for membership forms.

At Northeastern University: The completion of a new million dollar Student Center Building will make available to dramatic students a little theatre and a separate rehearsal stage.

At the Ohio State University: F. H. Knower was in charge of the Teacher Training Program in Speech at the Cincinnati Public School Teacher Training Institute in September.

Three representatives of Oxford University, Sir Edward C. G. Boyle, Mr. David K. Harris, and The Honorable Anthony Wedgewood Benn, debated at more than fifty American colleges and universities, and at Queen's College and the University of Toronto in Canada from September to December, 1947.

At Pennsylvania State College: Three new courses in Radio, including Advanced Principles of Radio Speech, Radio Organization, and a Seminar in Problems of Radio are being offered. Dr. Harold E. Nelson is in charge. Clayton H. Schug is executive secretary of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges. Paul R. Beall is chairman of the Labor and Management Relations Curriculum Committee in the School of Liberal Arts.

Working on a two-year project with the Office of Naval Research, Purdue University has been awarded contracts totaling $74,000 to investigate problems connected with military voice communications. Especially for this program, $10,000 is being spent to construct four new sound-proof, air-conditioned, acoustical laboratories for purposes of research and clinical evaluation in the fields of Hearing and Acoustical Analysis of Voice Problems. The Speech and Hearing Clinic is conducting the research.

At the University of South Dakota: The Black Hills Play House under the direction of Warren M. Lee completed its second successful season last year. A School of the Theatre has now been added. This school is an extension service and courses carry full university credit. The 1948 season and school will open about mid-June.

At Southwest Texas State Teachers College: The Speech Department cooperated with the Department of Special Education to sponsor a Speech Clinic and Workshop during the summer of 1947. Mrs. Geneva Foster of San Antonio was

in charge of the clinic, and Leland Burgum directed the workshop in education of exceptional children.

Dr. T. Smith McCorkle, Dean of the College of Fine Arts at Texas Christian University, has announced a revision and expansion of the Speech-Drama Department. A new fine arts building to cost more than a million dollars will house the enlarged department. Professor Lew D. Fallis will continue as administrative chairman of the department and will teach Interpretation.

At the University of Virginia: Members of the staff of the School of Speech and Drama are conducting throughout the state a number of clinics, demonstrations, and conferences in speech correction, debate, and dramatics. Speech clinics were held at Harrisonburg and Lynchburg. A survey was made of speech defects in the local county school and forensic demonstratations were conducted at some fifteen centers in the state throughout the fall.

THEY PROUDLY ANNOUNCE

At the University of Alabama: The appointment of Albert R. Bienert as assistant professor to serve in the Speech Clinic. The promotion of Miss Helen Osband to associate professor.

At the University of Arizona: Three new staff members, Lionel R. Scott as instructor in Speech; Ben C. Markland, manager of the University of Arizona Radio Bureau, as lecturer in Speech; Mrs. Abe Chanin as assistant in Speech. Mr. Scott formerly taught at Buena Vista College in Storm Lake, Iowa, and at Biarritz American University in France.

At Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: As director of Speech activities, Robert D. Snook, replacing Dr. Edward Gunberg who now serves as chairman of the Augustana English Department.

At Blue Mountain College: The appointment of Miss Jean Lowrey.

At Brigham Young University: Preston Gledhill appointed to work in Dramatic Productions, Interpretation, and Basic Speech. Mr. Gledhill holds a Master's degree from L.S.U., has served at Alabama, and last year worked on his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin.

At Brooklyn College: Appointment to the Speech staff—Joanna Alogdelis.

At the University of Buffalo: As Speech instructor, Eugene Vasilew.

At Colorado State College: As head of the Speech Section in the English Department, Frank Davis who has been doing graduate study at L.S.U.

At Teachers College, Columbia University: The appointment of Mrs. Hilda Stahl Wagner.

At Drake University: Ray Berrier, formerly dean of the Fort Dodge, Iowa, Junior College, appointed as assistant professor of Speech. Mr. Berrier is president of the Iowa Speech Teachers Association and is a member of the advisory board of the Central States Speech Association. He is chairman of a committee appointed by the State Department of Public Instruction to write a course of study in Speech for the state of Iowa. Gale Richards, formerly of the University of Akron Speech Department, has been appointed assistant professor of Speech. Charles R. Lown, recently associated with the University Theatre of the University of Chicago, has joined the Drama and Speech staff. Hattie Jones, formerly of the Speech staff of the College of St. Catherine in St. Paul, has also been appointed to the Speech staff.

At the University of Dubuque: As dean of the Liberal Arts College, Carl Dallinger, formerly professor and chairman in the Department of Speech. Dean Dallinger served eleven years in the Park College Speech Department and was chairman of that department from 1942 to 1946. As instructor in Speech—Miss Dorothy Hind, former high school teacher in Kansas and Missouri.

At Grinnell College: As instructor in Speech, Charles Paterson.

At the University of Iowa: As assistant professor of Speech and Dramatic Art, Dr. Harold Crane; as director of the Summer School, Professor H. Clay Harshbarger, director of Radio Speech and secretary of the Liberal Arts Advisory Board; as instructors in Speech—Charles L. Balcer, Grant Herbstruth, Curtis Pope, and Mrs. Betty G. Willhoite.

At Kansas State Teachers College: As director of the Speech clinic, Miss Gladys Briggs; as instructor in Dramatics and Theatre, Joseph A. Withey, and as instructor in Oral Interpretation and director of the Student Speakers Bureau, Miss Alice McDonnell.

At Kenyon College: New staff members, James Michael as associate professor, formerly in

charge of the theatre at Amherst; and Charles Lightfoot, assistant professor, who is now in residence at the Acoustic Laboratory, School of Aviation Medicine, NATB, Pensacola, Florida.

At Louisiana State University: As associate professor of Speech, Miss Edith Dabney.

At Marshall College: To the Speech staff, Ben Hope.

At Michigan State College: As director of the Children's Theatre in the Department of Speech, Dramatics and Radio, Miss Eleanor Chase, formerly assistant professor of Speech at Texas State College for Women.

At Michigan State College: The appointment of Dr. A. T. Cordray to the Department of Speech, Dramatics and Radio, and Written and Spoken English. Former chairman of the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art at Westminster College, Pennsylvania, Mr. Cordray served as a visiting professor of public speaking at the Pittsburg-Xenia Theological Seminary.

At Michigan State College: A new head of Speech, Dramatics, and Radio, Wilson B. Paul, formerly coordinator of the Basic Communication course at the University of Denver. A Ph.D. from the University of Iowa, Mr. Paul served seven years at the University of Denver where he was director of forensics, executive secretary of the Adult Educational Council, and director of the Denver Speakers Bureau.

At Montreal General Hospital, Montreal, Canada: The appointment as clinician of Miss Sarah Ivey, formerly with the Louisiana State University Speech Clinic.

At Northern Illinois Teachers College: As associate professor of Speech, Miss Laura Crowell.

At The Ohio State University: As associate professor, Michael H. Moser; as assistant professor, Edward Shulman; instructors—Stanley Ainsworth, Thomas B. Anderson, Wallace D. Fotheringham, Peter Kuchmy, and Frank Robinson.

At the University of Oregon: Gilbert Evans to teach courses in dramatic production.

At Pennsylvania State College: Full-time appointments, C. Cordelia Brong, Paul W. Keller, Harold E. Nelson, and Harold J. O'Brien. Part-time instructors, Milton J. Bergstein, Jeanne Hann, and Lucetta Kennedy.

At Russell Sage College: Appointed temporary chairman of the Department of Speech, Miss Jean R. Hartzel, during the absence of Mrs. Ruth A. Damon, chairman, who has been granted a year's leave; as instructors in Speech, Miss Marion V. Teeter and Harry M. Davidson.

At Sioux Falls College: As instructor of Speech and Dramatics, George L. Collins.

At the University of South Dakota: As instructor in Speech, Jack Bain; as teaching fellows, Arnold Anderson and Robert Kolp. As instructor in Radio and program director of KUSD, Robert Williamson.

At Southeastern Louisiana College: As associate professor, John Robinson, formerly speech correctionist of Ascension and Tangipahoe parishes in Louisiana.

At Southern Illinois University: Appointment of Cameron Garbutt, who last year taught at Cornell University and Dr. Archibald McLeod, formerly technical director of the L.S.U. theatre.

At Southern State Teachers College: New appointment, Mary Strahon Ritter.

At Southwest Texas State Teachers College: As assistant professor of Speech and director of Dramatics, James Barton, formerly of Oklahoma A. and M.; the promotion of Mrs. Jo Wayland Bennett from graduate assistant to instructor in Speech. The appointment of Dr. Elton Abernathy as chairman of the Speech Department replacing Dr. Hugh Seabury who now serves in an educational capacity with the United States Air Force.

At the University of Texas: The appointment of Miss Emogene Emery, formerly head of the Department of Speech at Mary Hardin-Bailer. As teaching fellows: Mrs. Ora Bennett, Guilford Jones, Martin Todaro, and Henry Ullom.

At Texas Christian University: New appointments, associate professor E. L. Pross named to head the Speech division and begin the Speech correction program; Dr. Walther R. Volbach to direct courses in drama; assistant professor Andrea Hetzel to work in Technical Theatre and Radio; Mrs. M. B. Herron to teach Radio and Public Speaking. Professor Pross last year served as chairman of the Languages-Literature Department at Murray State Teachers College. Miss Hetzell was formerly an instructor in Speech and Drama at the University of Minnesota, and Mrs. Herron was formerly of the Speech Department at the University of Southern California and has worked for the National Broadcasting Company.

At Union College, Barberville, Kentucky: The appointment of Miss Marjorie Donnell.

At the University of Virginia: As head of the School of Speech and Drama, Russell H. Wagner, formerly of Cornell University. As assistant professor of Drama and technical director of the Virginia Players, John A. Walker, formerly general manager of "The Lost Colony," Roanoke Island, North Carolina. As assistants, John D. Magaffin, James A. Hageman, Andrew Horton, and Edward Carmuche.

At the University of Washington: New staff members, Dr. E. Thayer Curry, Audiology; Dr. John Hoshor, Fundamentals and Rhetoric; Jack L. Bangs, Speech Correction; Mrs. Sholie R. Brown, Voice and Interpretation; Miss Elizabeth M. Jenks, Fundamentals; Mrs. Helen Stolte Grayun, Speech Correction; Michael Hogan, Radio Speech; William R. Tiffany, Speech Correction; James Shapely, Speech Laboratory.

At Westminster College: The appointment of acting chairman of the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, Donald L. Barbe. Professor Barbe has been a member of that department since 1943.

At Yankton College: As professor of Speech, L. Wayne Smith.

AT THE MEETINGS

The annual Eastern Public Speaking Conference will be held at the Hotel New Yorker in New York on April 15, 16, and 17.

The Louisiana Speech Association met at Alexandria, Louisiana in November.

Northwestern State College of Louisiana will be host to the 1948 state-wide drama festival on March 5 and 6. Early last November, more than 200 students and teachers from sixteen schools in Louisiana met at Northwestern State College for the second annual Drama Clinic. Lecture-demonstrations followed by forum periods were held on various problems common to high school students and directors.

At the University of Oregon: The University Theatre will hold a Regional Conference for students, faculty, and professional actors and producers on the week end of February 13.

At Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, in early October, Paul R. Beall, Harold E. Nelson, and Matilda Onachilla of Pennsylvania State College presented papers at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Speech Association.

Pennsylvania State College Speech and Hearing Clinic served as host to a meeting in November of faculty and Speech Correction majors representing a number of state teachers colleges.

The annual Pennsylvania State Debaters' Convention, a model student legislature, will hold its meeting at Pennsylvania State College on March 19 and 20, 1948.

The Rocky Mountain Forensic League met at the University of Denver in November. That institution will play host to the seventeenth annual Rocky Mountain Speech Conference February 12-14, 1948.

The Texas Speech Association met in connection with the Texas State Teachers Association convention during the Thanksgiving holidays in San Antonio.

The annual conference of the Virginia State Speech Association was held in Richmond in October. New officers for the year are: H. Hardy Perritt, University of Virginia, President; Miss Althea Hunt, William and Mary College, Vice-President; Miss Mildred Coiner, Waynesboro Public Schools, Secretary-Treasurer.

ON THE STAGES

The Theatre at Brigham Young University will present "A Comedy of Errors" in February, "John Ferguson" in March, "The Badman" in April, and an original student production in May.

At Kansas State Teachers College: "The Taming of the Shrew" will be produced in February.

At The Ohio State University: In cooperation with the Department of Romance Languages a group of graduate students in the Speech Department will direct a program of short plays of Cervantes in commemoration of the 400th Anniversary of the birth of Spain's great literary master.

At the State College for Women, Montevallo, Alabama, the Seventh Annual Drama Festival will be held on March 5, 6, and 7. The college announces the presentation on March 25 of "The Black Flamingo," and on April 24 of "Androcles and the Lion."

PERSONAL NOTES

From the University of Iowa: Bernard Bracher, who received the B.A. degree in Speech and Radio in June, is now sports editor for Radio

Station KRNT in Des Moines. Fred Barton, head of the Speech Department at Abilene Christian College, is on leave from that institution to complete the doctorate at Iowa. Don Ecroyd, on leave from Simpson College, is also studying at Iowa.

Bernard J. Knittel, who directs Forensics at Michigan State College, was visiting professor at the University of Maine last summer, teaching courses in Discussion, Debate, and Speech Composition.

Cecil Nickle, production director of the Department of Speech, Dramatics, and Radio at Michigan State College has returned to his duties after a year's sabbatical leave during which he toured the country visiting important college and university theatres.

Mr. and Mrs. Stuart Chenowith have recently completed a six-month postwar tour studying experimental theatres in European countries. The tour was sponsored by the School of Theatre, University of Denver. Mr. Chenowith has recently accepted a position as director of the Experimental Theatre in the Department of Speech, Dramatics, and Radio at Michigan State College.

From the University of Texas: Jesse J. Villarreal received the Ph.D. degree in Speech from Northwestern University in June. Howard W. Townsend received the doctorate from Wisconsin in August. N. Edd Miller, debate coach, was granted leave in September to study at the University of Michigan.

From the University of Washington: Professor F. W. Orr has retired from the administrative duties of the Department of Speech, but will continue in teaching. He began his work in 1925 with a staff which consisted of an instructor and two teaching fellows, and offered a few courses in public speaking and argument. He relinquished the leadership last July with an independent department offering a major for the B.A. and M.A., and a minor for the doctorate in Speech, and having a faculty of twenty-two persons. His work has been notable especially for the development of problem-solving discussion and courses in voice training for speech. He is the author of two basic textbooks, *Essentials of Effective Speaking* and *Voice for Speech*. Professor Orr has been a member of NATS and SAA since 1916, and was twice a member of the Executive Council of the Association. He was among the founders of the Western Speech Association and became its president in 1933-34. He took a leading part in founding the Washington State Speech Association. The new executive officer, succeeding Professor Orr is Dr. Horace G. Rahskopf who has been a member of the staff since 1928.